

THE MYSTICAL ELEMENT

IN THE

PAULINE EPISTLES

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

University of Edinburgh

by

C. M. CURRIE, B.A., M.A., B.D.

January, 1933.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

Chapter

I. SOURCES - DAMASCUS.

- (1) Sources.
- (2) Damascus.

II. PAUL'S MYSTICISM.

- (1) Paul's Mysticism.
- (2) Paul's Mysticism and Other Closely Related Conceptions.
- (3) Summary.

III. CHARACTER OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM.

- (1) Cross and Resurrection.
- (2) Paul's Faith or Christ Mysticism.
- (3) History Mysticism.
- (4) Cross and Resurrection Mysticism.
- (5) Sacramental Mysticism.
- (6) Ethical Mysticism.
- (7) Development of Paul's Mysticism.
- (8) Summary.

IV. FORMATIVE INFLUENCES DETERMINING PAUL'S MYSTICISM.

- (1) Pre-Christian Days, Conversion, Early Church, Jesus and the Old Testament.
- (2) Judaism.
- (3) Hellenism.
- (4) Summary.

V. MYSTICISM.

- (1) Historical Survey.
- (2) Definition.
- (3) Comparison.
- (4) Summary.

CONCLUSION.

APPENDICES.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

INTRODUCTION

"In the life and work of Paul, New Testament scholarship finds a problem surpassed in interest and importance only by that which is presented by the life of Jesus."

E. D. Burton.

"There is probably no more misused word in these days than 'mysticism'."

D. Butler.

"I am not acquainted with any treatise on Paulinism, nor any commentary on St. Paul's epistles, which gives a permanent place as I would wish to the distinctive notes or characteristics of mystical religion, which as it seems to me, forms the presuppositions on which his (Paul's) system of Christian theology is based."

W. R. Inge.

The apostle Paul, during his lifetime, was the stormy petrel of the early Christian faith, not only before his conversion, as the persecutor of the Church, but also later, as the defender of its freedom. In the history of New Testament thought, the Pauline question has been in like manner the centre of conflict. Baur, in his day, pitting Paul against Peter, made the apostle the object of controversy. Today, with the rise of the Comparative Religion school, the battle zone has shifted to the question of Paul versus Jesus. Was Jesus or Paul the true founder of Christianity?

If, within the field of New Testament criticism, the Pauline question is a very thorny one, within the field of the philosophy of religion, the problem of mysticism is equally beset with difficulties. The many definitions¹ of mysticism varying greatly in character illustrate the magnitude of this problem. Further, there is a new and widespread interest in

1. Inge - Christian Mysticism. In the Appendix several pages of definitions are given.

mysticism today, and certain schools of thought have welcomed it and praised its virtues, while others have looked upon it with disfavour, and have severely criticised its shortcomings.

These two larger questions form the background of the more immediate subject of inquiry of this thesis, namely, the mysticism of the apostle Paul, and both of these converge upon the specific problem, was Paul a mystic? On this question, New Testament scholars can roughly be divided into three classes: those who answer in the affirmative and neglect to define the term fully,¹ those who reply emphatically in the negative,² and finally those who with some hesitation classify him as a mystic.³ They are hesitant since the answer to this question is to be sought not only within their own field, namely New Testament criticism, but also within another, the field of the philosophy of religion and mysticism.

If it is accepted that Paul was a mystic, other problems arise: what was the character of the apostle's mysticism; what was its manner of expression; and finally what were the sources from which it sprang, Judaism, Hellenism, or Paul's own conversion experience.

After
/having stated the problems, the fields of investigation and the extent of this inquiry, the next step is to define the limits of this investigation. It will be assumed until the latter part of this thesis that the apostle was a mystic, and Rufus Jones' statement, 'Mysticism is simply religion at its most acute, intense and living stage,'⁴ will be accepted as a tentative definition of mysticism. The inquiry will be concerned mainly

1. Deissmann, Schweitzer, Peake and others.

2. Denney, Strachan, Rawlinson " " .

3. Moffatt, Kittel, Bartlet, Kennedy " " .

4. Rufus Jones - Studies in Mystical Religion, p. xv.

with the apostle's religious experience, which the writer believes to be mystical, and will therefore be confined within the field of New Testament criticism. The concluding chapter only will be an excursion within the field of mysticism, and this will be for the purpose of substantiating the choice of the writer's definition of mysticism, defending his claim that the apostle was a mystic, and lastly classifying that mysticism.

A further and twofold limitation of our inquiry within the field of New Testament criticism has been made by the title of this thesis. The question under investigation is the mystical element of the apostle. Other phases of Pauline study, his life and thought, his theology, his connection with the Church of the first days, Jesus, the Old Testament, and the world of his day, will be dealt with only in so far as they are closely related to and throw light upon his mysticism. Finally, this inquiry will be confined principally to the mystical element found in the Pauline epistles. The apostle's letters will form the primary data; the Acts of the Apostles, the secondary.

There is also the question of the method of approach, and one of three ways may be chosen. This inquiry might be primarily a lexical investigation of the mystical formula "ἐν χρίστῳ" and its companion phrases, and from this one might formulate his conclusions. Approaching the whole subject from another angle, after the manner of the Comparative Religion school, one might examine the religious life and thought of the world of Paul's day - Judaism and Hellenism - make certain comparisons with that of the apostle,

mark the similarities and differences and come to one's conclusions. There is a third method of approach, and the writer believes that this is the only adequate one. For an understanding of the apostle and especially his mysticism, lexical investigation has a part to play, the world of Paul's day has much of value to say, but it is imperative that one should go ^{to} the apostle himself, to his letters and especially to his career. Further, it is necessary to approach Paul from within, to note the inner life of Saul during his pre-Christian days under the law, to mark well the conversion crisis at Damascus, and above all else, to examine in every detail that Christ-indwelt life lived by Paul the Christian. When this has been accomplished, the apostle himself, his career, theology and relation to the world of his day—these different phases of Pauline study will unite in one consistent and harmonious whole, and the enigma, Paul, will become a great spiritual genius and thinker, and also a very human and lovable figure, the servant of Christ; and his mysticism, the supreme secret of his genius, will be intelligible.

There is the final question of a plan. The first chapter will consist of an examination of the sources, the primary and secondary data (the epistles and Acts), and of Paul's conversion experience at Damascus. Chapter two will follow with a preliminary study of the apostle's mysticism and closely related mystical phrases and conceptions, and chapter three will complete this with a more thorough investigation of the character of Paul's mysticism. Chapter four will deal with the formative influences determining

the character of that mysticism, each in order of worth — Paul's pre-Christian experience under the law and his conversion crisis, his relation to the early Church, to Jesus and the Old Testament, and the kinship of his mysticism with Judaism and the Hellenic world. This being completed, the New Testament phase of our investigation will be brought to a close. The final question, as to whether the apostle can rightly be called a mystic or not, remains to be answered, and this will require an excursion within the field of mysticism. The concluding chapter will be concerned with this. There will be an historical survey of Oriental (Brahmanism, Buddhism, Sufism), Christian (Ascetic and Humanist), and Prophetic Mysticism, concluding with a definition. We will turn then to what the critics and exponents of mysticism have to say regarding mysticism, defend our definition, complete this inquiry with a comparison of Paul's mysticism with those types, and end with a conclusion.

CHAPTER I

SOURCES ----- DAMASCUS

"....St. Paul's letters are soul pictures in such high degree that their writer is probably the best known man of the early Empire; not one of his celebrated contemporaries has left us such frank confessions."

A. Deissmann.

"In truth that vision near Damascus is the critical point on which all study of St. Paul's life must turn."

Sir William Ramsay.

I. SOURCES

A. Primary Data - The Pauline Epistles.

Since the days of the Tübingen school and their radical treatment of Paul's letters, a reaction has taken place in favour of accepting as genuine all but the Pastoral epistles. Baur, in his day, did not question the authenticity of Galatians, Romans, and First and Second Corinthians. Since then, the epistle to the Philippians had been added to this group, and today these are regarded as Pauline. Formerly, the eschatological section of Second Thessalonians appeared to be a very perplexing problem marking the letter as non-genuine. This difficulty has been met, and both First and Second Thessalonians are regarded now as coming from the pen of the apostle. In former times, the authenticity of the later epistles formed a problem, but now, with the acceptance of Philemon as genuine and not a forgery, they are regarded also by many as having been written by the apostle. At one time the letter to the Colossians was looked upon as the work of a second century gnostic, but today its likeness to Philemon marks it as genuine. The epistle to the Ephesians offers a greater difficulty, and the question of its authenticity is still an open one. Whether it is a catholicised version of Colossians from the pen of a "Paulinist imbued with his

Master's spirit,"¹ or a circular letter addressed to the Gentile Christians not visited by Paul, a letter which is the most mature fruit of Paul's spiritual genius, it is difficult to decide. Even though the former be true, the epistle is so filled with the spirit and the thought of Paul, that, in an understanding of him, this letter should not be passed over. The writer of this thesis accepts the latter view and regards the letter as genuine. Most scholars rule the Pastoral epistles out as the work of a Paulinist. These letters will not be consulted in this inquiry.²

Deissmann,³ in his reaction against Paulinism and Pauline theology, has possibly overstated the case when he described the epistles as unliterary and untheological. Reactions always have that tendency. If Deissmann has erred here, he has not in his contention that Paul's letters are "soul pictures," pen portraits, and that because of them Paul "is probably the best known man of the early Empire."⁴ His epistles pieced together will not give a consistent system of doctrine, or a completely developed philosophy. This is not to say that they lack in a reasoned estimate of Christianity. Paul's profound and penetrating mind was ever wrestling with the problem of defending and justifying at the bar of reason this new faith which he had espoused. He is, therefore, a thinker of the first rank. The epistles also portray him as a great leader and protagonist of Christianity in these first days, the first and one of the most outstanding of its missionaries. The personal note also runs through all his letters. Here one meets Paul the man.

With this

/statement however, all has not been said. The epistles have a further

1. Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p.388.

2. For a fuller discussion refer to Moffatt, also Julicher 'Introduction to the New Testament,' Peake's one volume Commentary and individual commentaries.

3. Deissmann, Paul, pp.3-26.

4. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, p.290.

worth. They are like facets of a diamond, each differing, throwing out its own flash of beauty and glory, pointing back to the deeps of a great personality, ^{glowing} burning and / with a Divine passion. They speak of one whose heart, mind and will were so captivated, controlled and mastered, that only personal, intimate and mystical terms ("it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me")¹ could adequately describe such an inner condition of being. They portray a life, whose wellspring, source and goal were Christ; a Christ-indwelt life, lived in mystical fellowship and union with Christ. At the heart of Paul's letters, there is this mystic life. In this portrayal the epistles differ from the gospels. The Nesus of the gospels is the Jesus of faith, the faith of the early Church, and not the Jesus of history, though the former may not differ greatly from the latter. The epistles give us the Paul of history; they offer a first-hand knowledge of the apostle. In his letters, one meets Paul, the missionary and Church statesman, Paul, the thinker and theologian, Paul, the friend and counsellor; and finally Paul, the man 'in Christ.' He, this last man, is the explanation of the others. Since the epistles come from the pen of Paul, and because they portray especially this man 'in Christ,' they will form the primary sources of this inquiry.

B. Secondary Data - Acts.

The question of the authorship of Acts and of its relation to the² gospel of Luke is a very difficult one. The researches of Sir John Hawkins,^{3&4} Von Harnack,⁵ and Sir William Ramsay have done much in the way of establishing the harmony of Acts and Luke, and of proving that the writer of both was Luke the physician, who, at certain periods of his career, was an associate and

fellow-traveller of Paul. These conclusions have been unhesitatingly

1. Gal. 2:20. Moffatt's translation will be used unless otherwise stated.

2. Sir John Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*. 3. Von Harnack- Luke the Physician.

4. Von Harnack - Acts of the Apostles.

5. Sir William Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*.

adopted by many scholars, including Moffat, Streeter,¹ and others. But the question is by no means settled. Foakes Jackson and Lake,² editors and co-writers with other scholars in their three volume work, have ably presented both sides of the case. Certain scholars^{3&4} leave the question an open one. All are in agreement that the problem of authorship does not invalidate the historicity, accuracy, and worth of Acts.

The question of the character of Acts and its relation to Paul's epistles remains to be discussed. Much scholarship and effort has been wasted in pointing out where they disagree and even contradict^{each other.} It is well to remember that both writers differ in character and manner of writing, and each has his own distinctive purpose and aim. There is a polemical and apologetic purpose behind the book of Acts, which determines somewhat the choice of material and manner of presentation. The author is writing a history or story of the early Church, and it is a very interesting and trustworthy account. The speeches he puts into the mouths of his heroes (the custom of ancient historians) are masterpieces, varied in character, and as a rule admirably suited to the occasion; speeches which in no way lessen the historical worth of the oral tradition behind them. The writer^{also} has great dramatic gifts, which are everywhere in evidence. It is true that he tends to heighten the miraculous, and emphasize especially, supernatural guidance. One cannot deny that at times he favours the striking and marvellous, and "loves a good miracle."⁵ Herein he is more a child of his age than Paul,

-
1. B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels.
 2. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake, Beginnings of Christianity.
 3. Foakes Jackson, Acts.
 4. H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke Acts.
 5. P. Gardner, Cambridge Biblical Essays, p.390.

and these facts will be remembered in dealing with the accounts of Paul's conversion found in Acts. His theology, ~~with that~~ of the tradition behind his work, is touched only here and there by phrases caught up from Paul and is quite representative of the pre-Pauline Gentile Church of Antioch and surrounding centres. Thus, Acts is invaluable as a connecting link between Paul and Jesus. Regarding the relation of Acts to Paul's epistles, the above named writers, Von Harnack and Sir William Ramsay, have also established the essential harmony of the two. If one ^{takes} /into account all these facts, the book of Acts can be reckoned as very valuable secondary data for an understanding of Paul. The epistles give especially the inner story, Acts, the outer history of the apostle.

II. DAMASCUS

A. Saul of Tarsus

Both the book of Acts and Paul's epistles are concerned mainly with Paul the Christian, and the information, regarding his pre-Christian days, is of a very scanty character. Yet, though there be only a few references, they are sufficient to give one some conception of Saul, the Pharisee and protagonist of Judaism. He was a Cilician Jew, born in Tarsus; "I am a Jew, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia."¹ He was also a Roman citizen "free-born",² a bilingual Jew, speaking both Greek and Aramaic,³ brought up a Pharisee, the most strict sect of Judaism.⁴ It is a matter of conjecture when Saul went to Jerusalem. There is a reference to his nephew living there.⁵ Possibly—but there is no certainty—Saul went to Jerusalem at an

1. Acts 21:39. Mft. 2. Acts 22:27-8 A.V. 3. Acts 21:37, 22:2

4. Acts 26:5

5. Acts 23:16.

early age, and grew up in the house of an elder married sister, where he found a second and his real home. He received his education at the feet of Gamaliel,¹ a famous rabbi, of whom little is known.² In Acts, Gamaliel is pictured in a favourable light, a liberal Pharisee, tolerant of other faiths,^{but} it is difficult to say whether this toleration was a matter of principle or expediency. Saul, his pupil, showed in no uncertain terms his attitude to other faiths, and it was not one of toleration.

B. What preceded Damascus

1. Failure of the Law.

In the story in Acts, of the phenomenal rise of Christianity in those first days, Saul of Tarsus is portrayed as its arch-enemy,⁴ and most bitter foe, a ruthless persecutor of the infant Church. Behind this fanatical campaign of persecution, there lies a burning zeal for the law and the religion of his fathers, Judaism.⁵ Saul was as intensely passionate in the practice of his religion ("I outstripped many of my own age and race in my special ardour for the ancestral tradition of my house"),⁶ as he was in its defence. The secret of Saul, the ardent defender of Judaism and one of the most outstanding of its younger leaders, is his consuming passion for righteousness. As he himself says, he was "ardent for God",⁷ "touching the righteousness which is in the law, blameless."⁸ The goal of his life was righteousness before God. He sought it in vain in Judaism and by works of the law,⁹ and found it in Christianity and by the way of faith.¹⁰ This is

1. Acts 22:3 2. G. Milligan, Gamaliel, H.D.B. Vol.II

3. Acts 5:34 4. Acts 22:4 5. Acts 26:4-5 6. Gal.1:14, Mfft.

7. Acts 22:6, Mff. 8. Phil. 3:6, A.V. 9. Rom. 10:5 10. Rom. 10:6

the key to the explanation of Paul. He was a spiritual Columbus. Judaism offered no haven to him. He found such in Christianity, and there opened up new continents, undiscovered spiritual realms within her world.

As a Pharisee, Saul accepted the standard of righteousness set down by the law, and he sought to fashion his life as all other Pharisees, in strict and punctilious conformity to its requirements. He achieved success¹ and in this endeavour, outstripping all his contemporaries, /fulfilling all legal requirements, until at last he could regard himself "blameless"² in the sight of God. Yet there was a great dissatisfaction within his soul, for this acquired perfection gave him no peace. In fact, there was rather a greater disquietude. The seventh chapter of Romans describes in graphic and telling language the steep and painful road over which Saul the Pharisee travelled, and the impasse which finally blocked his way. Within Saul there was a soul divided.³ Judaism and the law had failed him.

Paul's bitter experiment with Judaism and his later condemnation of it all has not made him too popular with present-day Jewish and even with some Christian exponents of Judaism.⁴ Older authorities⁵ with possibly somewhat biased Christian eyes did not do full justice to this religion. These modern exponents of Judaism have striven to vindicate it, and today, because of their endeavours, it is regarded in a more true and favourable light; but it seems to the writer that their enthusiasm for their task has

1. Gal. 1:14

2. Phil. 3:6.

3. There are those who disagree with this explanation in terms of a divided soul - Wrede, Wernle, Rawlinson, Enslin; those who agree.. Holscher, (see Schweitzer) Pfeleiderer; Deissmann; Peake; Moffat; Kennedy; Glover and many others. For another conversion crisis similar in character, refer to Lang - Study of Conversion, Sadhu Sundar Singh.

4. Abrahams, Schechter, Montefiore, Klausner; Christian - Hereford, Moore. The Judaism under discussion is Palestinian.

5. Schurer, Edersheim, Weber.

overstepped itself. They have difficulty with Jesus and His relation to Judaism, and they regard the apostle Paul as an impossibility. They all share the common fallacy, which makes their conclusions less trustworthy, that the Judaism of the Talmudic period is normative for that of the time of Jesus and Paul. In this way, the problem of the lack of historical data for the Judaism of this earlier period is simplified. Further, it is assumed that the Judaism of the first century was a unit similar in character to the Pharisaic Judaism of Talmudic times. The parties of the Essenes and Zealots and the movement under John the Baptist are ignored. Apocalypticism is regarded as but a backwash of Judaism. Paul's condemnation of Judaism is therefore most unjust, and even Jesus' judgment of it can be doubted.

A fair appreciation of Judaism must recognize that it represented one of the noblest attempts in history to apprehend the Divine will and translate it into human character and action. This was the greatness of Judaism, but it also had weaknesses. A true estimate must keep both in mind. Judaism, during the Maccabaeian period, had been fighting for its life against the inroads of Hellenism. Apocalypticism and legalism were the bulwarks which it erected against this new foe. Judaism sought to defend and preserve its life with the aid of these. Both movements, apocalypticism and legalism, sprang from the centre of the nation's life and burned with intense fervour. With the birth of Christianity, the former passed on into its ranks and lived there for a time. After the fall of Jerusalem, Judaism renounced it, and legalism became supreme. This had come into conflict with Christianity during Jesus' lifetime. He pointed out its weaknesses, and His follower, Paul, weighed it in a

1. The writer accepts the views of such scholars as Bousset, Burkitt, Oesterley, Box, Hollmann, Friedlander, Lightley, Branscomb.

balance, found it wanting, and discarded it. It lived on in the Judaism of the Talmudic period, and after the revolt of A.D. 70, it triumphed, and with the disappearance of its foes, became more tolerant and less militant.

Before and during the first century, it was almost a life and death struggle for Judaism. Apocalypticism offered a future way of salvation; legalism, a present. Yet, during and before the time of Jesus and Paul, already in Judaism there were those who had partially rejected the law as such. It was felt that works of the law alone were not sufficient, and faith was also cast into the balance.¹ This new movement within Judaism, giving more emphasis to faith than had formerly been done, anticipated to some extent the thought of Jesus and Paul. It was a movement which did not make much progress. Pharisaic Judaism was so convinced of and devoted to the law that it could find little room within the confines of its religion for faith. Further, it was only one of several sects within Palestine, and it had yet to conquer its rivals and win the masses of the nation. It appears also that, at this time, a bitter conflict was being waged between the two schools of Hillel and Shammai,² within Pharisaism itself. The former party took a more lenient and human attitude towards the keeping of the law by the nation; the latter insisted upon a complete fulfilment of the requirements of the law, written and oral, moral and ceremonial. During the lifetime of Jesus and Paul, it was very probable that the Shammaites were in the ascendancy, and in later times the party of Hillel became supreme. Therefore, at this time, legalistic Pharisaic Judaism was militant, fighting foes without and within, intolerant of its enemies, confident of itself, and blind to its own limitations. It was for Jesus and Paul to try it,

-
1. Treasury of works, 4 Ezra 8:33, 2 Bar. 14:12, salvation by the law, Pirke Aboth 6:6; protest against serving God for reward, Pirke Aboth 4:13; faith and works, 4 Ezra 13:23, 9:7-8, 7:34-5. (Charles Apoc and Pseud.)
 2. Branscomb - Jesus and the Law of Moses, pp.50-54.

separate the gold from the dross, and include the former among the treasures of Christianity.

Jesus discerned the deeply humanitarian and ethical spirit of the law (which owed its origin to the prophets), its insistence upon love for God, which transforms the inner life of man and creates love for man. He therefore summed up the whole law in one commandment.¹ He insisted upon complete obedience to this underlying spirit of the law, not flawless adherence to its myriad details, obedience which at times entailed the sacrifice of less important and especially ceremonial laws on behalf of the former. Therefore, religion was for Jesus an ethical relationship of love to God and man, not a legalism. Right living did not consist of living up to the minimum of a code of law, but to the maximum of God's love and goodness. There was a further fundamental difference between Jesus and the Judaism of His day, and this was perpetuated in Paul and Christianity. It goes back to their different conceptions of revelation. Judaism was the result of a belief that the age of prophecy^{and} /of inspiration was long past, and that the Old Testament and the law were its final product. God gave these to the Jews. Jesus, the early Church, and Paul the Christian, believed that the age of the prophets had returned^{and} /that the Spirit of God was again present, bringing new life. Judaism was the classic example of a religion of a book, a religion of authority; the religion of Jesus, that of inwardness and freedom; the religion of Paul and the early Church, that of a Person. In taking this view of religion, Jesus became the completion of the law and the prophets² and the challenge to Judaism to achieve its full and final destiny. This challenge was refused. In taking this view of religion also, Jesus, in one

1. Matt. 22:37-40

2. Matt. 5:17.

sense of the word, fulfilled Judaism; in another, He destroyed it. Within it there were the seeds of both life and death -- the heritage of the prophets and its future possibilities, and also legalism, formalism and ritualism. He pointed out the priceless value of the former, and enshrined them in His own religion. He pointed out ^{also} to Judaism the grave dangers of the latter.

Paul was essentially one with his Master in his estimate of Judaism, but unlike Him in that his knowledge of its true character came to him suddenly, and therefore with more painful and disturbing consequences. He had been reared a strict Pharisee and had trusted fully in Judaism and the law, but slowly and surely the religion of his fathers crumbled under his feet. The whole law had been given by God, written and oral, moral and ceremonial, and it must be kept in its entirety.¹ No compromise was permitted. This was an impossible attainment. Already within Judaism itself there were those who, like Paul, had come face to face with this dilemma.² The law insisted upon a complete fulfilment, and yet it failed to aid man in such. It had no power in producing the higher life.³ It set up an impossible standard and demanded that man should attain it, and do so unaided.

Shallower natures than Paul's might find satisfaction in a religion of this type. There was the questionable alternative of lowering its standards and accepting its requirements with reservations, thereby not rendering a complete allegiance of the whole personality of man. Paul's deeper

1. Gal. 3:10, Deut. 27:26, Gal. 5:3, Deut. 28:1-2, 4 Ezra 9:32, 33, 36.

2. 4 Ezra 8:35, 7:46.

3. Gal. 3:21, Rom. 7:9-11, 19.

nature would brook no half measures; his demanded a full surrender (this he was able to offer in Christianity). Further, there were dangers besetting the adherents of the law. The pitfalls of self-righteousness and arrogance lay in their path.¹ The law was regarded as pre-existent.² The Jews were a favoured nation because the law had been entrusted to them;³ the remainder of mankind must serve them.⁴ There was also the temptation of regarding religion as one does a balance sheet. A man by good works of the law might balance the debit and credit side of life and show a surplus of merits in his favour, thereby winning Divine approval.⁵ Such a religion could not satisfy Paul. It rather drove him to despair. But the primal root of all Paul's discord was the legal conception of God which Judaism offered.. Man's relationship to God was one of law, not faith.⁶ Man stood before God approved by works of the law. His treasury of works won for him his salvation.⁷ God was not a God of grace.⁸ In truth, religion was not a relationship in the deeper sense of the word; it was a legal agreement. It was a matter of statutory obligations, not spiritual freedom; obedience imposed from without, not the inward impelling of love.⁹ Finally, Paul's nature, like all great natures, was supremely conscious of sin within. He yearned for atonement and reconciliation with his God. At the heart of most religions, this need is felt and met. Judaism did not do this/ At Damascus, therefore, Paul's view of God was revolutionized, and these deep yearnings within his nature were met for the first time. Later, in mystic fellowship with Christ, they were completely satisfied.¹⁰

-
- | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Lk. 11:44. | 2. Ps. 105:8. | 3. Rom. 3:2, 9:4. | 4. 4 Ezra 6:55-56. |
| 5. 4 Ezra 8:33. | 6. Gal. 3:12. | 7. 2 Bar. 14:12 . | 8. Rom. 5:8. |
| 9. 2 Cor. 5:14. | | 10. Rom. 7:25 . | |

2. Protagonist and Defender of the Law.

Saul as a Pharisee tested Judaism to the full and found it wanting. He did this face to face with Christianity. The consequences were of vital importance both to Saul and to the latter. The deficiencies of Judaism were brought out the more clearly and driven home to the heart of Saul, as he was ^{into} thrown / contact with the first Christians, while carrying on his campaign of persecution in defence of his own religion. The soil of Saul's heart, with the failure of Judaism, became fallow ground for the seed of the Christian faith. It fell therein, found lodgment, grew and finally uprooted the old. This did not happen in a moment; it was a matter of time. Saul the Pharisee, defender of Judaism and persecutor of the Christians, did not give way to Paul the Christian without a heroic struggle.

The earliest days of the Christian faith are somewhat shrouded in silence. Acts does not give a clear-cut picture.¹ It appears that the first Christians were but a branch of Judaism under the leadership of Peter and James, the brother of the Lord. These resided at Jerusalem. With the inclusion of Jews of the Diaspora² living in Jerusalem, a new group sprang up within the Christian Church. They carried over their liberal views of Judaism and the law into the new faith, and formed a more radical right wing under the leadership of Stephen.³ Having been more tolerant towards Hellenism, they now saw the implications of Jesus' universalism and His view of the law. The rise of this Hellenist party meant a new lease of life to the early Church. The distinctive notes of Jesus' teaching and mission now came to the fore.

1. Refer to Knox - St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem (p.7-10) for a full discussion of many perplexing questions relating to these first days.

2. Acts 6:9.

3. Acts 6:5,8.

They stressed the necessity of faith in Jesus¹ and his death, and also repentance as the only means of salvation in the day when Jesus would return to judge the world. Jews of the Diaspora had tended to minimize the importance of the law. Now that they were Christians, these new converts set it aside. This brought the infant Church, especially this radical wing, into conflict with the non-Christian Jews of Jerusalem.

After the crucifixion of Jesus, the Sadducees had left the new sect alone. The Pharisees also guided by the advice of Gamaliel,² followed a like policy, and for the time being, the infant Church lived in peace, a branch of Judaism. With the rise of the party of Stephen, hostilities were renewed. This new group showed quite clearly to Judaism that Christianity was not just a part of the former, nor was it content to appear as such. It is difficult to know what Stephen preached, but it appears that he spoke out against the law, and this united both Pharisees and Sadducees against his party. He was seized and dragged before the Sanhedrin, and charged with blasphemy against Moses and God³ and talking against the temple and the law.⁴ He was found guilty and stoned to death.

In Acts, in connection with Stephen's stoning, Saul the Pharisee is mentioned for the first time.⁵ He is present, and gives his assent to the deed. From then on he plays the role of a protagonist of Judaism and the law and/persecutor of the early Church.⁶ He becomes the leading figure in this new campaign of hate waged by Judaism, leaving no stone unturned in his

1. Acts. 7:52.

4. Acts. 6:13.

2. Acts 5:34-39.

5. Acts 7:60.

3. Acts 6:11.

6. Acts 8:3.

endeavour to stamp out this new faith.¹ He goes to such lengths as seeking authority from the high priest at Jerusalem to carry on this campaign, and his request is readily granted.²

3. The Scandal of the Cross and the Claims of Christianity.

Saul's new policy to crush and stamp out the early Church brought him into close contact with the latter. He would hear their gospel and the claims they made on behalf of their faith. These explain Saul's adoption of such radical methods. At first the crucifixion had shaken and almost shattered the faith of the first disciples in Jesus. Instead of a throne, God had given the Messiah a cross. But with the resurrection appearances, this faith was reborn. Jesus was the Messiah, in spite of the cross. God, in raising up and exalting Him, had also vindicated Him.³ Their belief in His resurrection transformed their view of His death. In like manner, the conception of the cross experienced a radical change. The cross, once an enigma, was now regarded as divinely appointed and linked with the redemptive purposes of God. Jesus' own thoughts and words regarding His death and His linking together of the Son of Man and Suffering Servant conceptions helped them to transform this tragedy into a triumphant victory.⁴ It had been part of God's redemptive plan that Jesus should die, although His death was a crime committed by the Jews.⁵ Now they saw saving and redeeming significance in the cross.⁶ They therefore

1. Gal. 1:13-14, 23; 1 Cor. 15:9, Act. 9:1.

2. Act. 22:5, 26:10.

3. Act. 4:31-2.

4. Mk. 10:45, 14:24, Lk. 22:27....This is a very controversial question. Wellhausen, (Manson- Christ's View of the Kingdom of God) Bousset and Wrede claim that the titles, Messiah and Son of Man, were read back into the life of Jesus by the Early Church. Burkitt maintains that Jesus Himself accepted these titles and the early Church faced with the crucifixion linked the Suffering Servant conception with His Messiahship. Foakes Jackson and Lake regard this view as a probable one. Rawlinson, Bacon, Moffatt, Manson, Porter, Strachan and Hoskyns go back to Jesus for the source of both conceptions, Son of Man and Suffering Servant. Refer to Chap. IV for Bousset's view of the pre-Pauline Church.

5. Acts 2:23-4. 6. Acts 5:30-1, 10:43, 3:13-4, 1 Cor. 15:3-4

endeavour to stamp out this new faith.¹ He goes to such lengths as seeking authority from the high priest at Jerusalem to carry on this campaign, and his request is readily granted.²

3. The Scandal of the Cross and the Claims of Christianity.

Saul's new policy to crush and stamp out the early Church brought him into close contact with the latter. He would hear their gospel and the claims they made on behalf of their faith. These explain Saul's adoption of such radical methods. At first the crucifixion had shaken and almost shattered the faith of the first disciples in Jesus. Instead of a throne, God had given the Messiah a cross. But with the resurrection appearances, this faith was reborn. Jesus was the Messiah, in spite of the cross. God, in raising up and exalting Him, had also vindicated Him.³ Their belief in His resurrection transformed their view of His death. In like manner, the conception of the cross experienced a radical change. The cross, once an enigma, was now regarded as divinely appointed and linked with the redemptive purposes of God. Jesus' own thoughts and words regarding His death and His linking together of the Son of Man and Suffering Servant conceptions helped them to transform this tragedy into a triumphant victory.⁴ It had been part of God's redemptive plan that Jesus should die, although His death was a crime committed by the Jews.⁵ Now they saw saving and redeeming significance in the cross.⁶ They therefore

1. Gal. 1:13-14, 23; 1 Cor. 15:9, Act. 9:1.

2. Act. 22:5, 26:10.

3. Act. 4:31-2.

4. Mk. 10:45, 14:24, Lk. 22:27.... This is a very controversial question. Wellhausen, (Manson- Christ's View of the Kingdom of God) Bousset and Wrede claim that the titles, Messiah and Son of Man, were read back into the life of Jesus by the Early Church. Burkitt maintains that Jesus Himself accepted these titles and the early Church faced with the crucifixion linked the Suffering Servant conception with His Messiahship. Foakes Jackson and Lake regard this view as a probable one. Rawlinson, Bacon, Moffatt, Manson, Porter, Strachan and Hoskyns go back to Jesus for the source of both conceptions, Son of Man and Suffering Servant. Refer to Chap. IV for Bousset's view of the pre-Pauline Church.

5. Acts 2:23-4. 6. Acts 5:30-1, 10:43, 3:13-4, 1 Cor. 15:3-4

preached the gospel of repentance and remission of sins in Jesus' name, and waited for His early return in power to judge the world.¹

Jesus was regarded as Messiah now, not in spite of the cross, but because of the cross. The reality of the resurrection and the reality of the power or moral energy in the hearts of the first Christians, which they attributed to the Risen Lord, guaranteed this. In fellowship with the Exalted Lord, they experienced new life and moral power. God had redeemed them; their sins had been forgiven,² the new Messianic age had begun, and the promises of the prophets had been fulfilled.³ It is little wonder that Saul, the ardent defender of Judaism, on hearing this new gospel, chose such extreme measures in dealing with this new heresy. Saul realized that this doctrine of a Messiah because of the cross, a blasphemous paradox, would undermine the foundations of Judaism and the law. In putting Jesus the Galileean to death, the Jews had believed that they had put an end to His cause. His death had been God's denial of His claims. But now with the springing up of this new gospel of a crucified Messiah, the menace to Judaism was doubly strong. Saul discerned what the consequences would be for Judaism, if this new gospel were widely proclaimed. With the keen, penetrating intellect of a trained rabbi, he saw the issue, Judaism or Christianity; the law or the cross; righteousness by the law⁴ or righteousness through Christ;⁵ a Messiah crucified, a tremendous blasphemy⁶ and the law accredited, or the Crucified vindicated, God having raised Him up and exalted Him,⁷ and the law abrogated.⁸ Judaism must not tolerate so dangerous a rival; therefore Saul launched his campaign of

1. Acts 3:19, 2:38, 1 Thess. 1:9-10.

2. Acts 8:32-36.

3. Acts 2:16-21.

4. Gal. 2:21.

5. Rom. 3:22.

6. 1 Cor. 1:23.

7. Acts 2:23-4, Ps. 110:1. 8. Acts 6:13.

extermination.

In attempting to subdue the Christian faith, Saul was conquered. His own religious foundations within, which he had inherited from Judaism, were crumbling. Yet, between him and his acceptance of the Christian gospel¹ there lay the almost insuperable stumbling block, "σκαῖν δαλον", of the cross. Calvary had branded Jesus as accursed, "ἀνέθεμα ἰησοῦς"². The cross stood out as the emblem of Divine rejection and the sign of Divine punishment. In the death of Jesus, God had endorsed the verdict of Caiaphas and Pilate. Saul the persecutor was therefore fighting for God against this heretical sect. The cross was the stumbling-block. It was a double stumbling-block, for it also meant the abandonment of the law and the discarding of one of the foundation stones of Judaism. With the failure of the law to satisfy Saul's whole nature, this was removed, but as yet the cross blocked his way. Was Jesus accursed of God? The issue narrowed down to the meaning of the cross and the fact of the resurrection.

The first Christians were the deciding factor in the removal of all barriers and the conversion of Saul. He received from them the outer facts about Jesus³ -- especially His death, its atoning significance and His resurrection. He received from them also the inner facts about Jesus⁴, and these

1. Gal. 5:11, Rom. 9:33, 1 Cor. 1:23.

2. 1 Cor. 12:3, Gal. 3:13, Deut. 2:23.

3. Certain scholars, Ramsay, Moulton, J. Weiss, Von Dobschutz, Feine and Loofs (refer to Peake, Servant of Yahweh, p. 288, for the last two named) suggest that Saul saw Jesus in the days of His flesh and was possibly present at the crucifixion. This was a great factor in Saul's knowledge of Jesus and his conversion. This possibly cannot be dogmatically ruled out, but most scholars regard it as improbable.

4. The mind and spirit of Christ, His life of lowly love and self-sacrifice, the redemptive character of His personality and mission - as portrayed in their own lives.

became the basis of his later Christianity.¹ What won Saul, was not the testimony of their lips so much as of their lives, not what they preached but what they were. They themselves were commentaries on Jesus' death and resurrection. The outer facts would remove the intellectual doubts harboured in Saul's mind regarding the cross and the resurrection. The inner facts revealed by these living commentaries would drive home to the soul of Saul the truth of both.

The lives of the followers of Jesus were commentaries on the crucifixion.² They faced persecution and some martyrdom at the hands of Saul, in the same spirit and manner as their Master. Stephen's death is illustrative; the same forgiving love as that of Jesus,³ the same undying faith and sense of triumph which transformed their tragic deaths into glorious victories. Saul the persecutor, face to face with such, his own soul in conflict and turmoil as to the law and Judaism, could not but doubt at times the sincerity of his zeal on behalf of his own faith. Further, these martyrdoms threw some light upon the blackness which surrounded the cross of Jesus for Saul. Perhaps God had not made Jesus accursed, but had raised Him up. It might be that the cross was not a stumbling-block but central in God's redeeming purpose.⁴

1. Christ likeness, oneness with Christ, Christ indwelt lives, living histories of Christ, especially His death and resurrection, e.g. dying and rising with Christ. Refer for a fuller discussion to Chapter IV.

2. It is quite probable that others shared the same fate as Stephen.

3. Acts 7:60, Lk. 23:34.

4. This explanation assumes that for Paul also the cross became understandable in the light of the Suffering Servant conception. A difficulty arises. In Paul's epistles this title is not directly mentioned. This is sufficient proof to show that the association of Jesus with the Suffering Servant did not arise with Paul, that behind Mk. 10:45, 14:24, there lies an early tradition which comes from Jesus. (Refer^{to} p.15, note 4). The infant Church interpreted the cross of Jesus in the light of this, Act. 8:32, etc. and Paul likewise. He refers to this conception indirectly, Phil.2:6, Rom.4:25. In Rawlinson - New Testament Doctrine of Christ, p.241, this question is discussed and reasons are given for the omission of any direct reference to the title.

The lives of the first Christians were also commentaries on the resurrection. The followers of Jesus believed themselves to be men reborn, belonging to a new age and dispensation. The promises of the prophets had been fulfilled.¹ God had wrought His redemption in Jesus Christ,² and their sins had been forgiven.³ The Spirit of Promise had been poured forth upon them,⁴ and new power for moral living was theirs. They were children of a new era,⁵ which would be fully consummated when Jesus returned in glory. They had experienced a new thought of God, a new relationship to Him, a new faith, joy and power. Jesus' life, death, and resurrection had brought these.

The lives of the first Christians were testimonies of all this, and more. They were a proof not only of this new age and all its blessings, which the resurrection had inaugurated, but also of the resurrection itself. Jesus who had been crucified was not dead, but living. His cause was flourishing. His Spirit was guiding His followers. And as Saul persecuted the infant Church, it seemed as if he were striking a blow at Jesus Himself; "Saul, Saul why persecutest thou me?"⁶ It appeared as if Jesus lived on and in the lives of His followers. The cross had not been God's curse upon Jesus, but the way which He had chosen to work out His redemptive purpose for Israel and the world. In raising Jesus up and exalting Him, God had shown His approval and vindicated Jesus' Messianic claims. Slowly and surely this conviction dawned upon the soul of Saul. Many times he would ask himself in this campaign of persecution, was he striking a blow for God or against Him, was he the servant or the enemy of God, was God leading him into new paths and he was

1. Acts 2:16-21.

2. Acts 3:18.

3. Acts 2:38.

4. Acts 2:1-21.

5. Acts 3:21-23.

6. Acts 9:4, 22:7, 26:14.

A.V.

rebelling; ^{for} like a goaded animal, he was "kicking against the pricks." ¹ For one whose nature was so passionate and who so desired to stand right with his God, this situation would be well-nigh intolerable.

The death of Stephen intensified and hastened the climax of Saul's inner conflict. It was the immediate prologue to his conversion. The author of Acts notes especially that Saul was present and showed his approval of the crime. ² Further, he separates this incident from the conversion of Saul by one chapter only. ³ This appears to be deliberate, suggesting that the former was the cause of the latter. It is true that Paul, in his letters, does not mention the martyrdom of Stephen and his dying vision, yet it cannot be doubted that these shook the foundations of Saul's religious life and made his conversion inevitable. After the death of Stephen, most of the Christians fled from Jerusalem to the nearby regions of Judea and Samaria, hoping to return shortly. ⁴ The Hellenists especially forsook the city, and many went as far as Damascus, the home of other Christian converts. ⁵ The disciples remained in Jerusalem, ⁶ possibly in hiding, and were untouched, for Saul harried only those who had publicly set aside the law. Having, as he thought, suppressed this menace to the law in and round about Jerusalem, and hearing of the flight of the Hellenists to Damascus, Saul resolved to go thither and do as had been done in Jerusalem. ⁷ He was destined to enter Damascus not as a persecutor of, but as a convert to Christianity.

It is not to be thought that Damascus was a mere matter of a change of belief or opinion, a shifting of Saul's intellectual position and that this

1. Acts 26:14, A.V.

2. Acts 7:58, 8:1,

3. Acts 8.

4. Acts 8:1.

5. Acts 9:2.

6. Acts 8:1.

7. Acts 9:2.

took place gradually. For Paul, Damascus was the shipwreck and complete abandonment of Judaism and the law. It was a conversion, in the true sense of the word, a right-about-face, a turning of his whole personality from Judaism to Christianity—heart, mind and will. This is why Paul so often later used antitheses in his letters, — Adam, Christ;¹ works, faith;² law, grace.³ This explains why he described the Christian life as a new creation.⁴

It is not to be thought also that Paul's conversion came about gradually, the process being an even and ordered one. Our treatment thus far, in pointing out the steps leading up to Damascus, might suggest such. All Paul's references speak of it as happening suddenly.⁵ It was rather after the manner of a storm. There were the foreboding portents and signs, then the tempest broke. Peace and calm followed. Before the climax there were periods of light and darkness, faith and doubt, assurance and conflict.

By now the bankruptcy of Saul's own religion and of his position as persecutor was almost complete. Yet there was no subduing of his ardour. He fought on to the bitter end. Like a drowning man being swept over the brink of a cataract, he battled the more fiercely, as it drew him near. But it was futile for Saul to oppose a Power greater than his own. During periods of light and assurance, the truth of his own position and the faith of his fathers spurred him on with more fanatical zeal. He "harried"⁶ the Church; he punished in every synagogue with "frantic fury,"⁷ even unto foreign cities. This seemed to be to no purpose; "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of

1. Rom. 5:12-15.

4. 2 Cor. 5:17, Gal.6:15.

6. Gal.1:13. Mfft.

2. Gal. 3:2.

5. Gal. 1:15-16, 1 Cor.15:8, Phil.3:12-13, 2 Cor. 4:6.

7. Acts 26:11. Mfft.

3. Gal.5:4.

the church." In spite of his intense campaign of persecution, the Christian faith lived and flourished the more. In Saul's hours of darkness and doubt, he was conscious of the uncertainty of his own religious footing; his endeavours as a defender of Judaism seemed futile. He was persecuting those who had what his whole nature had longed for — faith, joy, liberty, a sense of triumph, a consciousness of sins forgiven,^{to be} right with and at peace with God (through the cross). As he rode on his way to Damascus, these thoughts would disturb the little inner tranquillity which remained. Further, behind was the haunting memory of Stephen's death, ahead Christians whom he was about to persecute. In such a frame of mind Saul went forward, now "breathing fire and slaughter,"¹ now asking himself ^{whether} / God was with him or against him.² The monotony and the solitude of the journey and the heat of the noonday sun formed the setting of the impending and final crisis.

C. The Conversion of Paul.

1. Damascus and the Resurrection

In one of Paul's letters,³ he refers to his conversion experience as one of the resurrection appearances, the last of the series—"..and finally he was seen by myself."⁴ In doing this, he links the problem of the Damascus crisis with that of the resurrection visions. They are, therefore, of the same character, and an understanding of the latter will aid greatly in solving the question of the former.

There are two traditions of the resurrection, the Galilean or

1. Acts 9:1, A.V.

3. 1 Cor. 15:3-8.

2. Acts 26:14.

4. 1 Cor. 15:8. Mft.

earlier, and the Jerusalem or later.¹ This earlier tradition forms the basis of Paul's account.² Luke³ contains an indirect reference to it. This Galilean tradition centres about Simon Peter. Jesus appeared first of all to him⁴ in Galilee.⁵ There is no reference to the empty grave or to the appearances to the women, so central in the Jerusalem tradition. Paul in recounting it, does not describe the precise form and nature of these appearances. Yet there are sufficient data to infer that their character was of such an overwhelming and compelling power, that it meant the rebirth of Peter's faith, and later that of the disciples, the rallying of the latter about him, creating the nucleus of the infant Church of which he became the head. And most important of all, it meant that the resurrection of Christ became the basis of the Church's living faith. The evidence is also sufficient to conclude that these appearances were inward and spiritual⁶ in nature, the result of the "in-working of God."⁷

The Jerusalem or later tradition, contained in the Synoptic gospels,⁸ centres its interest about the tomb. There is no direct reference to Simon Peter or Galilee. All these accounts have a materialistic bias. This tendency is held in check in Matthew⁹, and it finds its fullest expression in

1. For a complete discussion refer to Manson - Luke, p.278-282; Bacon - the Resurrection Appearances, Jour. Rel. Oct.31; Herrmann Sasse - Jesus Christ the Lord (Deissmann and Bell - Mysterium Christi). These scholars regard the resurrection appearances as inward and spiritual revelations. Contrary opinion claims that they were objective visions of Christ, who appeared in a spiritual and glorified bodily form. Refer, Shaw- The Resurrection of Christ, p.97; Sparrow Simpson - The Resurrection and Modern Thought, p.418. This thesis accepts the former view.

2. 1 Cor. 15:3-8.

3. Lk. 24:34.

4. 1 Cor.15:5

5. Mk. 14:28.

6. Manson - Luke, p. 279.

7. Bacon - The Resurrection Appearances, p.509.

8. Mk. 16; Lk. 24; Matt. 27,28.

9. Matt. 28:17.

Luke.¹ According to the Jerusalem tradition, the resurrection visions are objective; Jesus appears in spiritual bodily form. Beneath this tradition, there are traces of the older or Galilean.² This had come to be mingled with the other, overshadowed and finally supplanted in the Synoptics. These conclusions regarding the resurrection appearances and 1 Cor. 15:8 will form a valuable guide as we seek later to understand Paul's conversion experience.

2. Acts and Epistles.

On passing to this problem, the question of data arises. Earlier in this chapter, under the discussion of sources, it was concluded that Paul's letters would be of primary importance, and Acts secondary. A warning was also uttered to place us on our guard against certain tendencies and characteristics of the writer of Acts. He can write history and make a story interesting, but these gifts are somewhat marred by his love for the dramatic and miraculous. He further errs in his portrayal of the spiritual. He cannot always make the language of the senses speak of the transcendental world.³ The materialization of the supernatural is another of his failings. Having noted these deficiencies, we may proceed further.

It might be said that the writer of Acts has given the outer history of Damascus, and Paul the inner.⁴ There are three accounts in Acts, and in certain minor details they vary.⁵ These differences may be due to Paul's later confused recollections of what happened, and also to the different versions of the story in circulation, which the writer collected. It is probable

1. Lk. 24:31, 36, 37-39, 41-43. 2. Mk. 14:28; Matt. 26:32; Mk. 16:7; Matt. 28:7.

3. Refer to the Lukan accounts of the resurrection.

4. Acts 9:1-10; 22:3-10; 26:9-16.

5. Compare Act 9:7 "they heard the voice"; and parallel account 22:9 "they did not hear the voice;" also 22:7 "I dropped to the earth" and parallel 26:14 "we all fell to the ground." The third account omits to mention Ananias and those who accompanied Paul to Damascus.

that he was with Paul and heard his defence before Agrippa, and later wrote the third account from memory.¹ These minor differences should not form too great a problem, for all three traditions give the same impression throughout and are in essential agreement. Each mentions the bright light, the heavenly vision, and the articulate words.

Certain other relevant data should be noted in passing. Apart from his Damascus revelation, there were certain other visions given to Paul. These are found mainly in Acts, the vision at Troas,² the night vision at Corinth,³ the trance vision in the temple at Jerusalem,⁴ the second temple vision,⁵ and the vision at sea before his shipwreck.⁶ Along with these there may be placed certain references in Paul's epistles: his paradise experience;⁷ the revelation bidding him go with Barnabas to Jerusalem;⁸ and his thorn in the flesh.⁹

Paul's letters give the inner history of Damascus, and this divides under two heads: that which is more objective and descriptive of what happened outwardly, and that which is subjective, revealing the inner content and meaning of Paul's conversion. Dealing with the first, there is the verse¹⁰ discussed previously, where Paul classes his Damascus vision as the last of the resurrection appearances. Earlier in this same epistle, he describes his conversion as seeing Jesus, "have I not seen Jesus our Lord?"¹¹ This "seeing" is an inward and spiritual vision or revelation of that which does not belong to the material world.¹² His letter to the Philippians describes

1. McGiffert- Apostolic Age, p.120, regards this as the most reliable tradition.

2. Acts 16:7-10.

3. Acts 18:7-10.

4. Acts 22:17-21.

5. Acts 23:11.

6. Acts 27:23-25.

7. 2 Cor.12:1-6.

8. Gal. 2:2.

9. 2 Cor.12:7-10.

10. 1 Cor. 15:8.

11. 1 Cor.9:1. The verb used is the same as that found in the former verse, 1 Cor. 15:8, "ὀφείλω".

12. Refer to the previous discussion of the resurrection appearances.

his experience as being "apprehended of Christ Jesus,"¹ laid hold of by Christ Jesus. Saul's way on the road to Damascus was blocked by the risen Lord; He took hold of him and made him His slave. This all took place within the soul of Paul. The Ephesian epistle² links the Damascus revelation with his call as an apostle to the Gentiles and their inclusion within the New Israel of God. Most of the introductory verses of Paul's letters do likewise. His authority as an apostle comes from God and Christ and dates back to Damascus, "Paul an apostle, not appointed by men nor commissioned by any man but by Jesus Christ and God..."³

Three verses, the most important of all, throw light upon the inner character of Paul's conversion; they describe what took place within. The drama of Damascus was enacted within the soul of Paul. The accounts in Acts may suggest otherwise, but all Paul's references and especially these verses conclusively substantiate this interpretation. Damascus was a "revelation of Jesus Christ";⁴ it was an inward revelation to the soul of Paul as to who Jesus was. The second reference⁵ illustrates this more clearly "...seeing it is God who said 'Light shall shine out of darkness' who shined in our hearts to illuminate (others) with the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus." Damascus was like the first day of God's creation. Light broke forth upon the soul of Paul and dispelled the darkness. Jesus was not accursed. His cross was the revelation of the redeeming love and grace of God. This truth illuminated the heart of Paul. At Damascus, he met

1. Phil. 3:12-13, A.V.

2. Eph. 3:3.

3. Gal.1:1.

4. Gal.1:12. Mfft. See Burton - Galatians, p.433, discussion of "ἀποκαλύπτω"

5. 2 Cor. 4:6 - a free translation.

within his own soul this Christ. The final verse¹ portrays fully what took place within; "....it pleased God...to reveal his Son in me." It was an inward revelation of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and it was more—it was an inworking of Christ and indwelling of Him in the soul of Paul.

Other views have been offered as interpretations of Paul's conversion. One group of scholars² interpret Damascus as an objective vision of the risen Lord, who appeared in bodily (spiritual and glorified) form to Paul. There was little psychological preparation. This itself was so tremendous that it shook Saul's religious foundations, proved conclusively Jesus' Messianic claims, and drove Saul into the ranks of Christianity. There are those scholars who swing to the other extreme and explain Paul's conversion on a purely naturalistic basis, in the main ruling out the supernatural. Psychologists³ have especially erred in this respect, describing it as photism, hallucination, epilepsy, and other products of psychological weaknesses. Between these two positions—the purely supernatural on one hand, a divine miracle, and the natural, on the other a subjective creation, there range many shades of opinion.

-
1. Gal. 1:15-16, A.V. Lightfoot - Galatians translates the phrase simply as, by means of me, thereby interpreting the sentence as meaning an objective manifestation of Christ in and through Paul to others. Burton - Galatians, on the contrary translates it as in me or within me. It was a subjective revelation in and for the apostle alone. He further points out that this interpretation is in harmony with the meaning of the verb "ἀποκαλύπτω", a subjective revelation to an individual mind (refer to his discussion on p. 433). He also maintains that such an interpretation is in agreement with the theme of the chapter and epistle.
 2. Findlay - Paul, H.D.B. p.703; Weiszacher - Apostolic Age, Vol.I, p.9,15, 81-90; Sabatier - Paul, p.62.
 3. James - Varieties of Religious Experience, p.14; His hypothesis does not necessarily involve a denial of the divine origin of Paul's conversion.

Baur found the solution in Paul's psychological condition. Paul's temperament was ecstatic, and his conversion had much in common with an ecstatic vision.¹ Holsten, his pupil, developed this thesis further. The Damascus crisis was but the first of Paul's ecstatic visions, and this gave birth to the others.² ³Weinel explained Paul's conversion as the culmination of an emotional storm. ⁴Pfleiderer regarded it rather as intellectual in character. Most of these scholars claimed that the vision which Paul saw was but the projection outward of an inner psychological picture of Jesus. Some suggested that the controlling features of this were borrowed from Jewish and Hellenistic sources. ⁵Wrede found their origin in the Messianic dogmatic which the apocalyptic literature of Paul's day would offer. ⁶Weiss pointed back to Jesus' own death, and claimed that Saul was in Jerusalem on the passion week and at the crucifixion. This personal knowledge, the mental picture which would be formed then, and Saul's own idea of a heavenly Messiah would go to make up the outlines of Paul's vision.

These scholars are of the same mind in that they stress to an exaggerated degree the human and especially the psychological side of the apostle's conversion. They turn to the accounts given in the book of Acts and use these without caution or discrimination. Paul's own testimony regarding his conversion is almost totally ignored. When they do go to his epistles, it is to those sections which mention his ⁷thorn in the flesh and his paradise experience,⁸ and they make

1. Baur - Paul, Vol.I, p.69.

2. See Sabatier - Apostle Paul, p.57-56.

3. Weinell - St. Paul, p.76-80.

4. Pfleiderer - Paulinism, Vol.I. p.17. Hibbert Lectures, p.33

5. Wrede - p.151-3, Paul.

6. Weiss - Paul and Jesus, p.29.

7. 2 Cor. 12:7-10.

8. 2 Cor. 12:1-6.

a great deal of these. The question of his malady will always be a subject of idle speculation, contributing little to a true knowledge of Paul. As to his paradise experience, Paul does not inform us as to its nature. This also is shrouded in mystery. Imagination and fancy may play with it, but this will be to no valuable purpose. Paul himself never connects this experience with that of Damascus. He does not boast in mentioning it, nor does he ask his followers to make such an experience the goal of their endeavours. It is well known what Paul's own views are regarding visions and ecstasies, and his advice to the Christians of Corinth regarding such.¹ Paul himself had a nature² deeply emotional, capable of being greatly moved at times, but this is not to say that Paul was an ecstatic. To claim that he was such is to fly in the face of facts. The type of Christian living which Paul himself later typifies, so sane and normal, so completely controlled by a great and profound mind, and yet infused and impelled by warm spiritual emotion and feeling, springing from a heart on fire with the love of Christ, gives the lie to such a claim.

3. Conclusions regarding Damascus.

Earlier in this chapter, it had been concluded that the resurrection appearances, of which Paul's Damascus conversion formed the last of the series, were spiritual in character, inward, subjective revelations of the risen Lord.

On examining the primary data relating to Paul's conversion, these former conclusions/

-
1. Paul was reticent about mentioning his paradise experience, 2 Cor. 12:1, and he will not boast about it as the Corinthians had been doing. 5-7. He gloried rather in the privilege of sharing the fellowship of Christ's sufferings. 10. With Paul it was love, not tongues or ecstasies which should be coveted, 1 Cor. 13. Elsewhere he laid down a general rule regarding these, 1 Cor. 14:32.
 2. Certain classic passages in Paul's letters illustrate this, 1 Cor. 13, Phil. 2:1-11; Rom. 8:37-39.

conclusions were more fully substantiated. Difficulties were encountered on turning to the secondary data, and especially on examining the opinions of scholars who had based all their findings on the book of Acts. If one remembers the marked characteristics of the writer of Acts, and that his testimony is outer history while that of Paul is inner, then harmony is established between the two traditions, and all the facts point to the interpretation of the Damascus experience as an inward spiritual revelation of Jesus Christ to the soul of Paul.

A further question remains as to whether more light can be thrown upon the conversion of Paul or not. The evidence is scanty, and the temptations to speculate are many.¹ Yet one is not left completely in the dark, for Paul's later mysticism has valuable light to shed upon this time of crisis. True, there is a danger of reading back into Paul's conversion too much from these later days, and of finding his mysticism springing forth full grown from this hour. Precautions will be taken against committing such errors. These days and hours gave birth to that mysticism. It was then that Paul's mysticism was in the making; at that time seeds sprang to life which later grew, flowered, and attained maturity. It is therefore legitimate to turn in this direction for help. If the data suggest a certain interpretation and Paul's later mysticism corroborates this, then one is not far from the truth.

²
The suggestion was previously made that Saul was convinced as to the truth of the resurrection, mainly by the lives of the first Christians. They were living commentaries on the resurrection. Further than that, he came to believe that not only Jesus lived on, that His cause was not ended but

1. Those scholars with whom we have disagreed exemplify this.

2. See p.19.

flourished the more, but that Jesus, His spirit, He, Himself, was living on in His followers. Saul, in striking blow after blow at the first Christians, was in reality persecuting Jesus in them; "Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?....¹ I am Jesus... and you persecute me."

The early Church, a development from the disciple band, was a fellowship "κοινωνία."² So united were the first Christians that it appeared as if, "there was but one heart and soul among the multitude of the believers."³ They were linked together by one spirit, the Spirit of Christ. He abode with them, and continued to carry on His work through them. He dwelt in the infant Church. In persecuting the Church, Saul was persecuting Jesus in it. And He dwelt not only in the corporate body, but also in each individual Christian. Stephen in his death had revealed the spirit of Christ,^{and} Saul had seen Jesus in him. Jesus lived on in each of the believers. This explanation may seem somewhat far-fetched to our individualistic Occidental minds. Yet Paul's conception of solidarity,⁴ which he shared with his day, substantiates this view. One need also to remember that these mystical conceptions now only in embryo form are to be found full grown in the epistles, in Paul's thought of the Church as the mystic body of Christ,⁵ and the Christian as mystically being in Christ,⁶ and Christ in him.⁷ To the writer, the evidence suggests that these take their rise here, and at this time they were already in a process of formation.

The lives of the first Christians convinced Saul as to the truth of

1. Acts 9:4-5; 22:7-8; 26:14-15. Mfft. 2. Acts 2:42. 3. Acts 4:32. Mfft.
 4. Rom. 5:12, 15. 5. Eph. 1:22-23. 6. Gal. 6:15.
 7. Col. 2:5-7.

the resurrection. Jesus had risen and was living on in His Church and in the hearts of each individual believer. Belief in the resurrection of necessity led to belief in the cross, for the truth of the former substantiated the claims of the latter. And here again the lives of the first Christians were living testimonies. In the cross and resurrection, God had revealed His redeeming purpose for men; Christ had died for their sins according to the scriptures.¹ God's work of salvation had been accomplished;² man's sins had been forgiven.³ Him, whom the Jews had hanged, God in raising Him up from the dead had made a pioneer and saviour, granting repentance and remission of sins to Israel.⁴

Paul's conversion was an inward revelation—"... it pleased God..to reveal His Son in me;"⁵—an inward revelation to the soul of Paul of this momentous fact of the resurrection and this revolutionary view of Christ's death. Jesus was Messiah because of the cross. The law had been abrogated. God was not a God of law but a God of grace.⁶ And the apostle's conversion was more; Paul was brought face to face with a new and radical conception of the religious life which God intended him to live. The crisis was an inward revelation of Christ Himself to the soul of Paul,"..it pleased God..to reveal His Son in me."⁷ The exalted Lord, as with the first Christians, was also dwelling in the heart of Paul, living on in him. The Christian life was one indwelt by Christ. His conversion vision revealed to his heart that God was a God of grace, that Jesus the Crucified was the Risen Lord and Saviour, and that He had come to dwell in Paul's heart.

1. 1 Cor. 15:3-4, A.V.

2. Acts 4:10-12.

3. Acts 2:38.

4. Acts 5:30-31.

5. Gal. 1:15-16. A.V.

6. Rom. 5:12.

7. Gal. 1:15-16, A.V.

4. Significance of Damascus.

This momentous happening at Damascus had far-reaching consequences for Paul. Saul the Pharisee died, and Paul the Christian was born. The seed of Judaism was completely uprooted by that of Christianity. The faith of his fathers was abandoned, or rather was crowned and completed by that of Christianity. At Damascus, Paul found new foundations, a new centre for his life. Therefore he returned to it again and again. He re-dated the calendar of his life from this event. It was like a great watershed, dividing his life in twain.¹ It constituted his call as an apostle to the Gentiles.²

His ^{conversion} / was a complete "reductio ad absurdum," of Paul's former life. He had sought righteousness by works of the law, but all in vain. Now, he found it at the cross. His religious foundations had been law and works; now they were grace and faith. The cross, once an anathema, a stumbling block, the blackest cloud of Saul's unbelief, now formed the corner-stone of Paul's religious structure. It was the focus from which light streamed, lighting up the life, death and resurrection of Christ, and revealing the redeeming love and saving power of God. Therefore this approach of God in the Crucified demanded on Paul's part a surrender to Christ; it meant the creation in the heart of Paul of a love like that revealed in the cross. This surrender cast the soul of Paul, upon the living Lord so unreservedly, creating a fellowship so close and inward, that it was a oneness, "in Christ", Christ "in me."³ This love so remade Paul in the moral image and likeness of Christ that Paul could say, "...it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me...."⁴⁵

1. Light, darkness, 2 Cor. 4:6; new, old, 2 Cor. 5:17; life, death, Col. 3:1-5.

2. Gal. 1:15, Phil. 3:12-13.

3. 1 Cor. 1:30.

4. 2 Cor. 13:3

5. Gal. 2:20. Mfft.

CHAPTER II

PAUL'S MYSTICISM

"This 'Christ mysticism,' as Deissmann calls it, is the most characteristic element in the faith of the great Apostle."

H. T. Andrews.

1. PAUL'S MYSTICISM - A Preliminary Study

A. Method of Approach.

Scholarship will ever be indebted to Deissmann for his investigation of the question of Paul's mysticism. Here, especially, he was a pioneer, but his conclusions are somewhat limited by his method of approach. His anti-theological bias and almost complete disregard of the thought and theology of Paul have hindered a fuller appreciation of the apostle, and especially of his mysticism. By lexical investigation of the formula "ἐν Χριστῷ", he attempts to explain the latter. The meaning of the phrase is the key which unlocks its secret. Weber, in his able treatment of the subject, rejects the whole procedure of Deissmann.

"We have no right to disrupt (the unity of) the Christ - conception, the richness and depth of which is not comprisable within (the limits of) a simple formula; to start from the local (preposition) 'ἐν' and (so) to separate the Christ-conception from the Christ-mysticism...The Christ-conception in its richness gives to the formula (ἐν Χριστῷ) its whole wealth of content (or significance)."³

1. Deissmann - Paul, pp.4-6.

2. Weber - Die Formel "in Christo Jesu;" appendix pp.253-4. Weber discusses Deissmann's monograph-"Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'." The latter makes a study of such phrases as "ἐν θεῷ" "ἐν κυρίῳ" used in LXX and comes to the conclusion that Paul's phrase did not take its rise here. It was a creation of Paul which owed more to the Greek world than to the Septuagint. This conclusion led Deissmann to interpret the Christ-Paul relationship as analogous to air, which surrounds Paul and yet he breathes it, akin to the Hellenistic thought of spirit. Deissmann- Paul, p.140.

Weber also discusses other scholars' views of the formula.

3. Weber - op. cit. p.218.

Weber's method of approach is just the reverse. Lexical investigation is but one phase of the whole problem. The formula can only be fully understood in the light of Paul's thought of Christ.¹ Therefore one must turn to this and to Paul's mysticism.

B. Description of Paul's Mysticism.

1. Individual Aspect.

After Paul's conversion at Damascus, Christ crucified and risen became the supreme passion of his life. Before this, to Saul the Pharisee, the cross and resurrection were blasphemous untruths; now they were central in Paul's religious thinking.² The first Christians had linked them with the redeeming purposes of God. Now Paul regarded them as paramount. Here, his thought is original and timeless. It was he who first interpreted the cross and resurrection in the light of Heaven. He pointed out especially the hand of God at work in them. They, together, were the revelation of the redeeming love and the saving power of God.

For Paul, love summed up the story of the cross. Once it had been the black enigma of Saul's soul, now it illumined the whole mystery of Christ's life, death, and resurrection. At Calvary, God had done something for man which the latter could never do for himself; "God proves his love for us by this, that Christ died for us while we were still sinners."³ Forgiveness had been granted.⁴ Man had been reinstated a son of God.⁵

these

1. This method of approach and conclusions will be adopted by the writer.
 2. Conversion crises are characterized by this radical swing from one extreme to another, a complete reaction from a former position. St. Francis of Assisi is a case in point, a son of wealth, he espoused Lady Poverty. Paul's reaction was from blindness to deeper insight into the truth of the cross and resurrection.

3. Rom. 5:8. Mfft.

4. Eph. 4:32.

5. Rom. 8:15.

There is also Paul's more theological interpretation of the cross and resurrection. This is less valuable, for he used the thought categories or language of his time, categories not current today, and although he sought the aid of these, he found his task none too easy. The cross baffled interpretation. He therefore turned hither and thither for analogies and metaphors, discovering them in the lawcourts of his day,¹ or again in the temple sacrifices,² or the social institution of slavery.³ Jesus, by His death and resurrection, negatively had defeated sin, cancelled the score of the law against man, and put to route the world powers of darkness. Since He was the substitute and representative of humanity,⁴ and because of His sinlessness,⁵ He defeated, judged and condemned sin in the flesh, fulfilling the law's requirements.⁶ He died not only to sin but also to the law,⁷ redeeming men from its curse.⁸ His death was also a triumph over the angelic rulers and powers who were the real perpetrators of Calvary. Pilate and Caiaphas were but mere puppets. These elemental spirits, in putting Jesus to death, had overstepped the mark, thereby bringing about their own downfall. And Jesus by His resurrection had triumphed over them. He had released men from their bondage, and defeated them once for all.⁹ The cross therefore justified man, for on the cross Christ died in man's stead.¹⁰ Man's sins were forgiven;¹¹ a new status of righteousness was granted.¹²

Positively, Christ's death meant the sanctification of man.¹³ A new life in Christ was open to him—a life of faith and love, oneness, mystical^{14 15}

1. Rom.3:24; Gal.2:16. 2. Rom. 3:24; Eph.5:2; 1 Cor.5:7. 3. Rom.3:24.
 4. 1 Cor. 15:22. 5. 2 Cor. 5:21. 6. Rom.8:3-4. 7. Rom.7:4-6.
 8. Gal.3:13; Deut.2:23. 9. Col.2:8-3:1. 10. 2 Cor.5:14-21. 11. Col.1:14.
 12. Rom. 3:22. 13. 1 Cor. 1:2. 14. Rom. 3:22. 15. Eph. 6:24.

fellowship with Christ,¹ a life fashioned in the likeness of Christ,² transformed from within by Christ³ or the indwelling Spirit.⁴ Thus man was reconciled to God,⁵ and found access to the Father.⁶ Redemption had been won.⁷ All took its rise from Calvary. Both the negative and positive sides of this new life had the cross as their centre.

In the thought of Paul, the resurrection is closely associated with that of the crucifixion. Without the former, the latter would have been only a tragedy. God had also been at work in the resurrection. He had raised⁸ Jesus up and exalted Him to His right hand,⁹ thereby vindicating Jesus' claim to Messiahship.¹⁰ The resurrection had disclosed God's redeeming power.¹¹ His Spirit of holiness would not permit death to triumph over Jesus.¹²

Behind all Paul's technical and theological arguments regarding the cross and resurrection, there is a basic conviction which unifies and sums up all these others. It is one which Christianity can neither outgrow and go beyond, nor afford to do without. This goes back to the mind of Jesus Himself.¹³ The life, cross and resurrection viewed together, were a mighty deed¹⁴ of God. In them, and especially for Paul, in the latter two, the dynamic love of God had been active.¹⁵ The work of Christ revealed the forgiving, redeeming love of God.¹⁶ Christ, because of love for man, had died upon the¹⁷ cross, and this love was the full manifestation of God's love.¹⁸

Love begets love. The Divine love in Christ raised a passion of love in return, in the soul of Paul. He calls this faith: "... it is no longer I

1. Rom. 8:10 2. Gal. 3:27. 3. Rom. 8:9-17. 4. 1 Cor. 6:11.
 5. Rom. 5:10-11. 6. Eph. 2:18. 7. Eph. 1:7. 8. Rom. 10:9.
 9. Rom. 8:34. 10. Phil. 2:5-11. 11. 1 Cor. 6:14; 2 Cor. 13:3-4.
 12. Rom. 1:3. 13. Moffat- Love in the New Testament, p.34.
 14. 2 Cor. 5:17-21. 15. Rom. 5:8. 16. 2 Cor. 5:19. 17. 2 Cor. 5:14.
 18. Rom. 8:32-39.

who live, Christ lives in me; the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself up for me." ¹ Faith is a very rich idea for Paul. It is man's response to the approach of God's love in Christ. It is the hand which man stretched out to receive the Divine mercy and grace. The cross was the revelation of the self-giving of God. In return, man must do likewise. He must surrender his whole personality, heart, mind, and will. He must trust God absolutely. Man must give himself by faith to Christ, in whom God had loved man, thereby warranting that trust. This faith surrender cast the soul of the apostle upon the risen Christ, creating a personal fellowship so close and intimate that it formed a mystical union.

By faith, Paul was united in an intimate fellowship or oneness which was mystical in character, and which he described as being "in Christ." This union was more than a moral union, more than a union of will and mind. It was deeper and more intimate, including the emotions or heart. It involved the union of the apostle's personality with that of the risen Christ. Paul compares this state to a marriage relationship. It differed from the latter in that it was purely spiritual. By marriage, two persons are made one in the flesh. This mystic union united the apostle in a spiritual marriage with the risen Lord; "...he who joins himself to the Lord is one with him in spirit..." ² They were spiritually one. In this mystical union or oneness, the personalities of the apostle and the risen Christ coalesced or were blended. In one sense of the word they remained distinct; in another they were one. By means of this fellowship, the apostle transcended the narrow limits of his own personality/

1. Gal. 2:20, Mfft.

2. 1 Cor. 6:17, Mfft.

personality, and became one with a personality vaster and more universal. A new man "in Christ" was born out of this mystical union. "I have been crucified with Christ and it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me..";¹ "There is a new creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ; what is old is gone, the new has come."²

The apostle's doctrine of mystical union is closely related to his theological thinking, and especially to his doctrine of justification by faith. It is the new man "in Christ," the new man who is mystically one with Christ by faith, whose sins are forgiven, who is granted a new status of righteousness before God, and upon whom the verdict of justification is pronounced. Union with Christ also creates that new character which marks that man as sanctified by God. The apostle's theological doctrine of justification and sanctification is therefore part of his larger doctrine of mystical union.

Living in mystical fellowship with Christ all Paul's former zeal and passion for the law and Judaism he now transferred to Him. God's sacrificial love revealed especially in Christ's death intensified this the more, until Christ became the supreme object of the apostle's adoration and worship. His one desire now was to live with Christ. Christ was his life, its source, ground or sphere, and its goal;³ "life means Christ to me";⁴ "Christ who is our life.."⁵ This mystical life "in Christ" continued throughout the apostle's lifetime, and at death was crowned and completed with a more glorious life beyond the grave—life "with Christ."

The love of God was the most tremendous power with which Paul had ever come in contact. This had been revealed in the love of Christ, and in

1. Gal. 2:20, Mfft.

2. 2 Cor. 5:17, Mfft.

3. This phase of the apostle's mystical teaching and that touched upon in these few pages will be developed more fully in Chapter III.

4. Phil. 1:21, Mfft.

5. Col. 3:4, Mfft.

His passion and resurrection. These, therefore, became central in the apostle's mystical faith union with Christ. In gratitude he sought to know that love,¹ to know Christ and His death and resurrection. His passion was to re-enact the drama of Calvary and the resurrection in his own life,² and thereby incarnate the spirit and love of the Crucified within. Paul therefore speaks of dying and rising with Christ. Faith not only brought Paul into mystical union with Christ,³ but also with the Crucified and the Risen Lord. He desired to share the fellowship of Christ's sufferings,⁴ to die and rise with Christ.⁵ God's mighty deed revealed in the cross and resurrection would be reproduced again in the life of the apostle, and that redeeming love so fully manifested would be experienced in the heart of Paul. The apostle's faith and Christ mysticism was, therefore, also a Cross and Resurrection mysticism.

Paul's Cross and Resurrection mysticism, being but one phase of his faith or Christ mysticism, was also closely allied with his theological doctrine of justification and sanctification.⁶ God's cosmic act at Calvary in Christ had won for man redemption from sin, the law and the powers of darkness. This act must be repeated in the believer's experience, before its fruits may be tasted by him. Subjectively, therefore, Paul must share in Christ's death and resurrection in order that these benefits won by Christ may be his. He must mystically be united with Christ in His death and resurrection, and die and rise with Him.

The apostle's mysticism was profoundly moral in character; it was an ethical mysticism.⁷ Paul, confronted with God's wonderful love revealed in the

Crucified, surrendered his whole personality, heart, mind, and will to Christ.

1. Eph. 3:19. 2. Phil. 3:10. 3. Phil. 3:9-10. 4. 2 Cor. 1:5.

5. Rom. 6:5-6. 6. Refer to pp. 35-37.

7. This will be discussed more fully in Chap. III.

This love was the greatest moral force which the apostle had ever encountered. It took up his life into itself, so heightening and intensifying it morally, so transforming it into the moral likeness of Christ, the revelation of the Divine sacrificial love, that Paul could find no other phrase with which to describe this experience more fittingly than "Christ in me" or "I in Christ." His surrendered personality in mystical union with Christ was so intimately united to Him that Christ's nature, His love and spirit pervaded the apostle's whole being, until his old sinful self was no more, until Christ dispossessed the old Saul and dwelt in him fully—"Christ in me"¹ and "I in Christ."²

The apostle's faith union with Christ implied a surrender of Paul's whole personality—his will as well as his heart and mind. The apostle's will was now one with Christ's will, especially in relation to sin and to God.³ Paul's faith, evoked in his heart by the Divine love, had united the apostle to the risen Lord in a mystical union. This faith was so ethical in nature that it transformed Paul into the moral image of Christ.⁴ He partook of Christ's character, especially that of lowly love and self-sacrifice.⁵ Brought by faith into a mystical/

1. Col. 1:29, Gal. 2:20.

2. Gal. 5:6; Rom. 8:2.

3. Rom. 6:2-12.

4. Col. 3:10.

5. Phil. 2:2-8.

mystical fellowship with Christ, which identified Paul with Christ's character and spirit, he experienced within his own soul a new power,¹ not his own, which made for righteousness. He traced this power back to Christ and God, and named it the indwelling Christ, or the Spirit of God or Christ.²

The apostle's Cross and Resurrection mysticism, the counterpart of his faith or Christ mysticism, was also moral in character. The victory of Calvary was a moral one. This moral victory and its fruits must be made a reality in the life of the believer. There must be an ethical dying to sin and a living unto the risen Lord, sharing His resurrection life which had triumphed over sin and the powers of evil. This was a daily happening. The cross had been a solitary act of God, done once for all, on behalf of mankind. The resurrection was also an event in time, following the crucifixion, and it was more. It did not begin and end with the rising of Jesus from the dead.³ The resurrection of Christ had been the revelation of the redeeming dynamic love of God at work. This resurrection and the operation of that love had not ceased.⁴ Paul daily experienced it.

1. Gal. 5:16.

2. Rom. 8:9-10.

3. 1 Cor. 15:4 - Jesus died, was buried, appeared; aorists are used. The resurrection is described in the perfect tense, "ἐγήγερται," called a monumental Semitic perfect. The resurrection was not merely a fact based on past experiences to the immediate disciples, but it was also a contemporary and momentous happening in Paul's own experience. See Strachan, Historical Jesus, pp. 42 - 47. Moulton - Grammar of the New Testament, pp. 137-8.

4. 2 Cor. 4:10-12, 16.

Dying with Christ, Paul shared the fruits of Calvary's victory, and died to sin. Rising with Christ, he rose to His resurrection life. God's Spirit of holiness¹ had been at work in the resurrection, and was still at work in this resurrection life of the believers. Paul rose with Christ to this resurrection life, with all its freedom from sin, its moral dynamic, and power for Christlike living.² This faith and Christ mysticism, this cross and resurrection mysticism of Paul is also, therefore, an ethical mysticism.

2. Social Aspect.

Paul was no mere individualist in his religious thinking, and thus there is a social side to his mysticism. The mystical union of the believer with Christ³ became also a resultant union of the brethren in Christ. Being "in Christ" implied for Paul, being in the fellowship, the "Koinonia" created and sustained by Christ.⁴ Paul's faith, which linked him in that mystical relationship with Christ, was also a social bond which united him with his fellow Christians.⁵ This union of Christ, Paul and the believers constituted the Church. They were like an organism; one spirit united them, the Spirit of Christ.⁶ They functioned as one unit. They were Christ's mystical body; He was the Head.⁷ He dwelt in this Body, the Church, continuing by means of it His redemptive work.⁸

This phase of Paul's mysticism and the interpretation of the phrase, "in Christ", in the light of his mystical conception of the Church has been

1. Rom. 1:3-4.

4. Gal. 5:6.

7. Eph. 4:6.

2. Rom. 6:2-12.

5. Eph. 4:3.

8. Eph. 2:11-22.

3. Rom. 12:4-8.

6. 1 Cor. 12:27.

stressed by certain scholars. ¹ They have also tended to deny the more individual aspect. Christ is equated with the Church. ² The mystical phrase, "in Christ", means nothing more than being in the Church. The experience of being "in Christ" is mediated through being in the fellowship of the Body of Christ, the corporate Christ. Such mystical terms as "baptized into Christ" ³ and "putting on Christ," ⁴ imply merely incorporation into the Christian community.

"It is a mistake to attempt to derive his (Paul's) 'Christ-Mysticism', expressed most succinctly by the phrase 'in Christ,' from mystical experience of the individualistic kind; it belongs to his doctrine of the Church....." ⁵

By this method, the more individual aspects of Paul's mysticism and his thought of Christ as personal (they regard Christ as wholly corporate) are explained away. It is true that there is the temptation to emphasize one of these phases to the neglect of the other. A true interpretation must keep both in mind. Paul, like all human beings, in matters of life and religion, was both an individual and a social being. And an understanding of Paul's mysticism must take both into account. Further, to the writer, this interpretation of Christ as merely corporate, which these scholars offer, is too mechanical. Paul's inward, passionate and personal mysticism ⁶ has something more than this as its object. The Christ of Paul is personal, with whom the apostle has personal fellowship. And He also dwells in His Church, for it is here that Paul experiences this personal fellowship.

-
1. Rawlinson - New Testament Doctrine of Christ, p.157; Strachan - Individuality of St. Paul, p.238; C.A.Scott- Christianity according to St. Paul, p.157. C.H. Dodd - The Church in the New Testament, "Essays Congregational and Catholic" ed. Peck, p.1-15, and other scholars.
 2. C.A. Scott - op. cit. p.157.
 3. Rom. 6:3.
 4. Gal. 3:27.
 5. Dodd - op. cit., p.15.
 6. Refer to Chap. III.

The social side of Paul's mysticism is also brought to light when¹ one notes the relation between the apostle's mysticism and his ethics. The Hebrew of the Old Testament did not separate his religion from his morality.² Here, Paul is in agreement. His mysticism and his ethics are a unity. The apostle's mystical faith relationship with Christ is at heart a moral relationship. This is of such a character that it includes within it his fellow³ believers, uniting them to Paul by love. This also is supremely moral. His relationship with his fellowmen is determined by his relationship with Christ. This Christ is his pattern and dynamic in dealing with his fellowmen.⁴

II. PAUL'S MYSTICISM

and other closely related Conceptions.

A. The Church.

1. The Christian Koinonia.

The fellowship or koinonia with Christ, which Paul expressed by the formula "in Christ," was of such a nature that it created also a koinonia between Paul and his fellow Christians. The mystical phrase, "in Christ," was social in character as well as individual, and included within the mystical Christ-Paul relationship also the believers "in Christ." Paul's faith, which was the personal tie linking him with His Lord, was also a social bond uniting him with the followers of Christ. This faith became active in a twofold way. It expressed itself towards Christ in an adoring trust, a love which surrenders all. It manifested itself towards the brethren in a love like that of⁵ Christ. Love was the principal product of faith in the sphere of human

1. This question and also the preceding one will be discussed more fully later in this chapter.

2. Micah 6:8.

3. Gal. 5:6.

4. Rom. 14:15.

5. Eph. 5:2.

relationships— "faith active in love."¹ It was "the bond of perfection"² among the Christians, and was due to their faith.

Thus it is that Paul's more personal mystical conception of being "in Christ" is inseparable from that of his social, mystical conception of the Church, the believers "in Christ." In Ephesians, Paul speaks of the Church as the "unity of the faith."³ Again he describes it as the "household of the faith."⁴ Brought by their faith into that personal, mystical relationship "in Christ," by that same faith they are all made one "in Christ."⁵ Faith creates a relationship of trust with Christ, and a fellowship of love with the brethren.⁶ Through faith, believers are incorporated into the Church, and only by continuing in it can one remain a member of the Body. Such faith made of the Christians a distinct social group which was conscious of its own separation from the world and its own solidarity.⁷

Love, the creation of faith, is that power which binds all believers together into one Body, making the Church a reality. This Church is a spiritual organism, and love, like the life-blood of a human organism, is the common element which pulsates through all, making the Church a living spiritual unity.⁸ Love binds all the brethren together, and inspires mutual co-operation. They live not for themselves but for one another and the Church of which they form a part.⁹ Since for Paul, love described Christ and God, he also speaks of the Holy Spirit or the Spirit of God and Christ as that which unites the believers.¹⁰ The Church is a "fellowship of the Holy Spirit." It is a "unity

1. Gal. 5:6.

2. Philem. 5. After mentioning Philemon's love and faith, the apostle adds the prayer that his friend's fellowship in faith may become effectual.

3. Eph. 4:13.

4. Gal. 6:10.

5. Gal. 3:26-28.

6. Col. 1:4.

7. 1 Cor. 10:32.

8. Eph. 4:3, 15-16.

9. Rom. 12:4; 1 Cor. 12:12.

10. 2 Cor. 13:14. Mfft.

of the Spirit;¹ "there is one Body and one Spirit."² Thus love and the Holy Spirit are the primary constituents of the Church.

2. The Body of Christ.

Paul thought of the Church as the Body of Christ. The believers were brethren "in Christ." There is a strong possessive note in this teaching. Christ dwelt in His Church; His Spirit, love, abode in it, thereby bringing it into being.³ In the days of His flesh, Christ lived in a human body; now the risen Lord dwelt in His Church.⁴ The Church was therefore a spiritual and organic unity in a living relationship to Christ. So close was this, that to sin against one of the brethren was to sin against Christ.⁵ The Church was composed of many members, apostles, prophets, but one Body;⁶ it had a diversity of gifts, wisdom, knowledge, faith, but the same Spirit.⁷⁸

Paul varies his mystical metaphors of the Church, but there is no radical change in his meaning. By doing this, he brings out more fully the richness and spirituality of his mystical conception. The Church is the household of God,⁹ or the household of faith.¹⁰ It is a building, a temple,¹¹ "a habitation for God in the Spirit."¹² The Church is the mystic bride of Christ. He died for her, thus consecrating her unto Himself.¹³ He is the mystic head of the Church.¹⁴ She finds the seat of her life in Him, and He nourishes her.¹⁵ The Body is subject to the Head.¹⁶ Christ is also the cornerstone of the Church,¹⁷ His temple or building.¹⁸

3. The Mission of the Church.

1. Eph.4:3. Mfft. 2. Eph.4:4. Mfft. 3. 1 Cor.12:12-27. 4. Eph.4:16.
 5. Col.3:15. 6. 1 Cor.8:12; 12:26. 7. 1 Cor.12:27-28. 8. 1 Cor.12:4-11.
 9. Eph. 2:19. 10. Gal. 6:10. 11. Eph.2:20. 12. Eph.2:21.
 13. Eph. 2:21. Mfft. 14. Eph.5:25-27, 1 Cor. 11:3. 15. Eph. 4:16, 5:23.
 16. Eph. 5:29. 17. Eph.5:24-25. 18. Eph. 2:20.

Paul's conception of the mission of the Church of Christ is equally as spiritual as his thought of the Church. It had been the secret of God,¹ now revealed, His eternal purpose to reunite a divided humanity, to accomplish a world-wide reconciliation.² In Christ's death and resurrection, this³ had come to pass. The mystery of the ages had been revealed. The barrier (the law) between Jews and Gentiles had been broken down.⁴ The latter were no longer "aliens to the commonwealth of Israel and strangers to the covenants of the Promise,"⁵ but now fellow-heirs.⁶ All had been reconciled to God by the blood of the cross.⁷

The Church of Christ had a part to play in this work of reconciliation. She was to fulfil what Christ in His death had inaugurated. She was to bring to final completion God's work of reconciliation.⁸ The goal of the Church and of humanity was a new man "in Christ."⁹ Abiding in the Church, Christ would bring to fulfilment God's age-long plan of redemption. For this purpose Christ had chosen the Church, and consecrated her as a bride.¹⁰ Therefore she must separate herself from the world, and remain faithful to Him and to her mission.¹¹ Every local church located in Judea,¹² or Laodicea,¹³ or elsewhere, belonged to that universal Church, the mystical Body of Christ,¹⁴ not made visible just in one place, but created by the Spirit of Christ, and made manifest wherever men are by faith "in Christ" united to one another "in Him." Thus each is part of that larger whole, and shares in Christ's work of world-wide reconciliation, the creation of a new humanity "in Christ," the founding of a Divine commonwealth, the new Israel of God.¹⁵

-
1. Eph. 3:3. 2. Eph. 3:6. 3. Eph. 2:13. 4. Eph. 2:14-15.
 5. Eph. 2:12. Mfft. 6. Eph. 3:6. 7. Eph. 2:16. 8. Eph. 4:15-16.
 9. Eph. 4:13. 10. Eph. 5:27. 11. 2 Cor. 11:3. 12. 1 Thess. 2:14, 13. Col. 4:16
 14. Eph. 1:22; 1 Cor. 15:9.
 15. Eph. 2:12. The question of the development of Paul's conception of the Church will be dealt with in the last section of Chapter III.

B. The Sacraments

1. Baptism.

Paul carried over his mystical conception of "dying and rising with Christ" and linked it with his thought of baptism. This described the believer's experience while undergoing the rite. On professing faith in Christ, by baptism the believer was united in fellowship with Christ, and incorporated into His Body, the Church. The sacrament itself brought this to pass. It was also a symbol, an impressive picture, an enacted drama of what took place within the soul of the believer at this time. He "was crucified," "buried", and "rose with Christ."

There is a personal or individual and a social aspect in the thought of the apostle regarding this rite. ^{In} dealing with the former, further divisions can be made. Jesus, in His death and resurrection, died to and triumphed over sin, the law and daemons.¹ Objectively, He won this victory upon the cross. Subjectively, the believer shared in the benefits of this by dying and rising with Christ. Baptism accomplished such. Negatively, the Christian disappeared beneath the water. This is a vivid picture of how by faith, he is crucified and dies with Christ to sin, sharing the fruits of Christ's triumph.² Forgiveness is granted.³ There is a crucifixion of the old life to the law and sin.⁴ Positively, the believer rises out of the water. This is an impressive picture of how the Christian is by faith mystically united with Christ and lives with Him, His resurrection life sharing its moral power and freedom from sin.⁵

1. See pp. 35-6-7; 39-41. 2. 1 Cor. 6:11. 3. Col 3:12-13.
4. Rom. 6:3-6, Col. 2:11-12. 5. Rom. 6:3-10., Col. 2:12-15.

This experience is thoroughly moral in character; it means a death¹ to the old life of sin and a putting on of Christ with all His moral purity. Ideally, this takes place at baptism. In actuality, this must be accomplished in the daily living of the believer. "We believe that as we have died with Christ we shall also live with Him.....So you must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus our Lord. Sin is not to reign then over your mortal bodies..."² The whole baptismal experience is conditioned by faith.³

Socially, the rite symbolized the incorporation of the believer into⁴ the Church. It was a sign and seal of their entrance into the Christian koinonia.⁵ The gift of the Holy Spirit was given.⁶ Baptism was more than a symbol or an impressive picture, a sign or seal—it was a sacrament. When the believer was baptized, it was a time of great spiritual crisis. Then he renounced his old life and offered his allegiance to Christ, identifying himself with the Christian brotherhood. This was a momentous step. Receptivity and faith were present then. The result was a wonderful spiritual refreshment and enhancement of power, a new inrush of faith, a fresh realization of communion with Christ. Thus for Paul, baptism was a sacrament,

"a symbol conditioning a deeper and decisive experience of Divine grace already embraced by faith. But all is psychologically conditioned, being thereby raised above the level of the magical or quasi-physical conception of sacramental grace."⁷

2. The Eucharist.

1. Gal. 3:27.

2. Rom. 6:8-12, Mfft., Col. 2:20. 3. Col. 2:12, Gal. 3:26-27.

4. 1 Cor. 12:13.

5. Eph. 1:13.

6. 1 Cor. 12:13; Eph. 4:30.

7. Bartlet - Baptism, E.R.E., Vol. 2., p. 377.

¹
 Dr. Moffatt¹ has pointed out that there were three elements in the primitive thought of the Lord's Supper — commemoration of Christ's death, communion with Christ, and fellowship with the believers. All three are found in Paul's epistles. He regarded the supper first as a feast of commemoration² of the sacrificial death of Jesus. His death and the shedding of His blood, inaugurated a New Covenant³ and God's redemption.⁴ The rite pointed back to that sacrificial death of Christ and to the redemption won; "...do this in memory of me.... 'as often as ye drink it, do it in memory of me.' For as often as you eat this loaf and drink this cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes."⁵ It spoke of a redemptive order already instituted by Christ's death, and it looked forward to the future consummation of this, at the Parousia.⁶

⁷
 The supper was regarded also as a communion of the believers with Christ. The bread broken and the wine poured forth sacramentally united⁸ Paul by faith, in mystical union with Christ and His crucifixion. They brought him into mystical communion with the body and blood of Christ, ^{into} partnership with the Crucified, thereby as in baptism enabling him to partake of the benefits of Christ's death and ^{to} share in His resurrection life.

⁹
 The rite was also a fellowship of the believers, one with the other. It was a bond of brotherhood which closely knit together the members of the mystical Body. Brought into union with Christ by this supper, they were consequently knit in a relationship one with the other. This mystical

1. Moffatt- Theology of the Gospels, p.198.

2. 1 Cor.11:25-26.

3. 1 Cor. 11:25.

4. Refer to Chap. IV for a full discussion of the relation of Paul's thought of the Supper, to that of the early Church and Jesus.

5. 1 Cor. 11:24-26. Mfft.

6. 1 Cor. 11:26.

7. 1 Cor. 10:16.

8. Used in the same sense as in Baptism, p. 48.

9. 1 Cor. 11:29.



fellowship with Christ which was characteristic of this sacrament was of such a nature that it included within it the brethren "in Christ."¹

This sacrament was also ethical in its character and its results.² It must not be taken unworthily.³ Faith had to dwell in the heart of the believer as he partook. With faith indwelling, the sacrament, this "acted parable," was such that it would rouse and invigorate faith. And thus the believers were carried beyond the symbols, the bread and wine, to the Reality behind, the Living Lord, and to the reconciling grace which had been revealed in His death.

C. Ethic.

1. Source of Paul's Ethic.

After Paul's conversion at Damascus, Christ and His cross became the foundation stones of his mystical life. Upon these also, he founded his ethic. Calvary was a revelation of God's redeeming love. Paul's answer to this was twofold. To God, it was faith in Christ creating a mystical faith union with Christ. To man, it was love like that of the Divine. Because Christ Himself was love, because supremely in His death, Paul had beheld God's love, there streamed over him, from communion with Christ, that love as the power of all ethical action in his own life. It was the force which worked for ethical good in his own soul, transforming his nature. It was that which permeated his relationships with his fellowmen. Therefore Paul's ethic was founded upon a tremendous historic fact, God's great deed, in the life and cross of Christ. Jesus, Calvary, and the redeeming sacrificial love of God were its source,

1. See --- Personal and Social aspects of Paul's mysticism, p. 43-4-5.

2. 1 Cor. 10:1-12.

3. 1 Cor. 11:27-28.

dynamic and pattern. Consequently, the apostle's ethic was transcendental in character, and his faith mysticism was ethical to the core, an ethical mysticism to which his ethic was inseparably related, and from which it took its rise; "in Christ Jesus circumcision is not valid...but only faith active¹ in love."

2. The Personal Side of Paul's Ethic.

God's wonderful love in Christ evoked in the soul of Paul a like passion of love. Towards God and Christ it was a living faith, which refashioned Paul in the moral image of that in which it trusted, namely God and Christ. The Divine love, on the surrender of the apostle to Christ in mystical faith oneness, took his whole life up into itself, transforming it into the spiritual likeness of "the Crucified."² "I am controlled by the love of Christ, convinced that as one hath died for all then all have died, and that he died for all in order to have the living live no longer for themselves but for him who died and rose for them.....There is a new creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ. What is old is gone, the new has come. It is all the doing of the God who has reconciled me to himself through Christ...."²

The Divine love had wrought a tremendous miracle in Paul's own soul.³ The result was a new creation: Christ had been formed in Paul.⁴ The old Paul no longer lived; Christ lived in him.⁵ Paul had died with Christ to sin, and had risen with Him to a new sinless life.⁶ Ideally, the apostle regarded this already as having taken place. In actuality, it was yet to be more fully achieved. Thus, this being "in Christ" and "dying and rising with Christ" Mfft.

1. Gal. 5:5-6; / Other references illustrating the close relationship between this ethical mysticism and Paul's ethic - Eph. 3:16-18, 1:15, 6:23, Col. 1:4, Phil. 2:1, 1 Thess. 5:8, 2 Thess. 1:3, 1 Cor. 13:13.

2. 2 Cor. 5:14-18. Mfft.

3. 2 Cor. 5:17.

4. Gal. 4:19.

5. Gal. 2:20.

6. Rom. 6:2-12.

were both a present moral experience and a progressive moral endeavour.

Christ, Paul's life,¹ was also the goal of all Paul's moral endeavours.² The apostle strove to live a life like Christ's, in opposition to that of sinful flesh.³ The life of Jesus must be made manifest in Paul's flesh.⁴ He must put on the new man "in Christ," "which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness."⁵

Calvary was the greatest moral fact in Paul's world; therefore he must enact the moral drama of Calvary in his own life. Impelled by the love of the cross, Paul sought to reproduce in his own person the mind and spirit of the Crucified.⁶ He must imitate God and Christ.⁷ He and his fellow Christians must offer themselves to God, and their members as weapons of righteousness.⁸ Having been bought with a price, they must glorify God in their bodies.⁹ Calvary spoke of the sacrifice of Christ for them; therefore they must present their bodies a living sacrifice unto God in like manner.¹⁰

Calvary's love begat all this in the life of Paul, a love which took its rise in the Crucified and in God. Therefore he describes its operation within his soul as the work of the indwelling Christ, or again as the Spirit of Christ, Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit.¹¹ For Paul, the Spirit is the dynamic redeeming love of God which had been revealed in Christ, and had become operative in human hearts, especially through His death and resurrection. Within the apostle, it was this new power, not his own, which worked for righteousness, a tremendous moral dynamic which expressed itself in Christlike character

1. Phil. 1:21.	2. Phil. 3:14.	3. Rom. 8:3.	4. 2 Cor. 4:11.
5. Eph. 4:17-21, A.V.	6. Phil. 2:1-11.	7. Eph. 5:1, 1 Cor. 11:1.	
8. Rom. 8:5.	9. 1 Cor. 6:20.	10. Rom. 12:1-2.	11. Rom. 8:1-10.

and Christlike love towards his fellow-men. The Spirit inspires love.¹ Love is the first fruits of the Spirit.² Therefore the believers must walk in the Spirit and not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.³ They must live in the Spirit.⁴

3. The Social Side of Paul's Ethic.

It has been pointed out already in the preceding pages,⁵ that the faith koinonia between Christ and Paul was of such a nature that it included within its limits the brethren "in Christ." Thus Paul and his fellow Christians were linked together in a koinonia, the bonds of which were love. The "Koinonia" of all the believers formed the Body of Christ, the Church. Love or the Spirit of Christ was the spiritual life-blood which made the body of Christ a spiritual organism.⁶ The brethren "in Christ" must "be loving for love is the link of the perfect life."⁷ They must follow the rule of love,⁸ for the whole law is fulfilled in that word.⁹ They must live as the Crucified, "being like minded, having the same love."¹⁰ The cross was their dynamic and pattern; therefore they were to walk in love, just as Christ had loved them and had given Himself up to be a fragrant offering and sacrifice to God.¹¹ They were to forgive, for both God and Christ had forgiven them.¹² Brotherly love was the only condition of religious insight, and the key to the understanding of the Divine love in Christ. Brotherly love was a revelation of that Heavenly love.¹³

Paul was a Jew in his ethical teaching. Religion and morality were inseparable. His mystical faith relationship with Christ was a moral one, and

1. Rom. 15:30. 2. Gal. 5:22. 3. Gal. 5:16. 4. Gal. 5:25.
 5. Refer to p. 43-45. 6. Eph. 4:3-16. 7. Col. 3:14. Mfft. 8. Rom. 14:15.
 9. Gal. 5:13-14, Rom. 13:8. 10. Phil. 2:2. A.V. 11. Eph. 5:2.
 12. Eph. 4:32, Col. 3:13.

13. Eph. 3:17-19. This inter-relation of human and Divine love is stressed more fully in Johannine mysticism. 1 Jn. 4:20-21, 7.

it linked by love in that relationship, the brethren "in Christ." Paul was a Christian in his ethical teaching, for his ethic took its rise, and found its dynamic, ground, and pattern in the Crucified. The apostle's mysticism was ethical. His faith or Christ mysticism, his cross and resurrection mysticism were moral, through and through.

D. Eschatology.

1. Paul's World View.

Paul's "Weltanschauung" like that of most Jews of his day was eschatological. Hellenic pessimism took a full look at the worst. Jewish eschatology said, "the best was yet to be." The law and eschatology were the reply of Judaism to militant Hellenism; they were the defences which the faith of the Jew flung up to protect his religion from the inroads of Greek culture, civilization and religion.¹ Eschatology claimed that God was about to act and fulfil His past promises, and in the struggle between evil and good He would win the victory. This hope was by now both political and religious, national and individual. It was portrayed by the apocalyptists² of the day, in varied, grotesque, and fantastic imagery.

Jesus, a child of His age, accepted this philosophy of history. How far He made this one of His central beliefs is another matter and a question keenly discussed by scholarship.³ It is the opinion of the writer that it

formed but the background of Jesus' thought of His Messiahship and mission.

1. Burkitt - Jewish and Christian Apocalypses, p.8.

2. Enoch; Psalms of Solomon; Jubilees; Assumption of Moses; 2 Esdras; Baruch.

3. Three views are held. 1. Complete disregard of eschatology. Wellhausen (Manson - Christ's View of the Kingdom, p.62-67) 2. A consistent eschatology; central in His teachings; J. Weiss (Manson) Schweitzer - Quest of the Historical Jesus; Sanday - Jesus Christ, H.D.B. Vol 2. Dr. Sanday popularized the eschatological view in this country. 3. Transmuted eschatology, Manson - op.cit; Von Dobschutz - The Eschatology of the Gospels; E. F. Scott - The Kingdom of God.

It was the framework or mould into which He poured His religion. This mould shaped the latter somewhat, but that is all. It was the earthen vessel in which He placed His heavenly timeless treasure. His disciple, Paul,¹ was one with His Master in this respect. Eschatology was subsidiary, belonging only to the outer circle of the apostle's ideas, yet valuable in an understanding of these and of his mysticism. Behind both the teaching of Jesus and Paul, there is the thought of a new moral supernatural order. Neither was concerned with the time nor the approaching crisis. In contemporary thinking, this order was as a rainbow of promise ever on the horizon. The chief concern was not when the promise would be fulfilled but rather that God would fulfil it. Jesus believed that, through His life and mission, God had acted, and that the kingdom had already a present reality.² By His death the kingdom would be fully consummated in the future.³

2. The Apocalyptic Mystical Phrase, "with Christ,"

Paul describes the present aspect of the kingdom by the phrase, "in Christ," and the future hope by the formula, "with Christ." The latter was eschatological as well as mystical. By this the apostle lifted up the mystical phrase, "in Christ," and all that it implied and played the whole theme in a higher key. "In Christ," Paul had been justified, sanctified, forgiven, reconciled to God. The gift of the Spirit, new life, sonship, was his. Redemption had been given. For Paul this was a present experience. The King-

dom of God, the supernatural moral order was already a fact in the apostle's

1. Two views of Paul's eschatology. 1. A consistent eschatology-Schweitzer-Paul and His Interpreters; the Mysticism of St. Paul. Dr. Schweitzer is the chief exponent of this position - a full discussion in Chap. IV; 2. Transmuted eschatology. Kennedy - St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things. This is the generally accepted view.

2. Matt. 12:29; parallel, Lk. 11:20.

3. Matt. 26:29, parallel, Lk. 22:16.

life.¹

The eschatological mystical phrase, "with Christ", pointed beyond the present to the final consummation. Redemption stretched into the future. In the light of the cross, the apostle viewed humanity as sinful and lost.² With the return of Christ, salvation would be accomplished in a completed sense, and mankind would be redeemed.³ At this consummation, redemption would include the whole man, body and spirit.⁴ Christ would appear and institute His Kingdom and judgment.⁵ Then His work would be completed.⁶ The dead, who would share in this salvation, would rise, and with the living, dwell "with Christ," all having been transformed (the whole personality) in conformity with the nature of the glorified Christ.⁷ Thus, in the apostle's thought, his mystical fellowship "in Christ," his life "in the Spirit", is continued beyond death, and finds its completion in the eschatological mystical experience of dwelling "with Christ." The present life "in Christ" is a foretaste of that more glorious life "with Christ."⁸ That future heavenly life of communion "with Christ" was already a present fact. Even now the believers were a colony of heaven.⁹ Yet this life was not to be compared with that future life; "the best was yet to be."¹⁰

3. The Parousia and Resurrection.

¹¹
Certain scholars have argued that the apostle's eschatological hope recedes completely into the background in his later epistles, and his view of the resurrection becomes more spiritual. He regards death now as the immediate passing of the soul, clothed with its new and appropriate organism, into

1. 1 Cor. 4:20; Col. 4:11; Col. 1:13. 2. Rom. 1-3. 3. Rom. 13:11, 1 Thess. 1:10.

4. Rom. 8:22-23. 5. 2 Cor. 5:10, Rom. 2:5. 6. 1 Cor. 15:24.

7. Phil. 3:21; 1 Cor. 15:53-54. 8. Eph. 2:5-7; Rom. 8:17.

9. Phil. 3:20. 10. Col. 3:2-4.

11. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Clemen, St. John Thackery, etc.

the presence of God and Christ. The hypothesis is put forward that the apostle was led to this alternate view as he became better acquainted with the Hellenistic literature of Alexandria. The view is a result of a literalistic and pedantic interpretation of Paul's statements.¹ At times the vista of the kingdom would lengthen out for him; at others it would seem to contract. In the Thessalonian epistles the "Day of the Lord" is very near, and the apostle hopes to share in it during his lifetime.² Undoubtedly, in his later letters, the outlines of his expectations are far more vague than in the former. The term, hope "³ἐλπίς", almost exhausts his eschatology. But this does not justify the assumption that there was a gradual development in the apostle's thinking to a more Hellenistic position. The middle epistles deny this. In the second epistle to the Corinthians the hope recedes.⁴ It is in the foreground in Romans.⁵ At the same time, in this epistle the possibility of dying before the parousia is by no means excluded.⁶ The epistle to the Philippians blends both these divergent elements in his outlook. The whole evidence proves conclusively that Paul had no thorough-going, consistent scheme of eschatology.

Closely connected with the Parousia hope is the apostle's thought of the resurrection. Paul borrowed this also from his day and generation. The theory that his view of the resurrection developed in his later epistles along Hellenistic lines is also untenable. The apostle's conception of an intermediate state has not changed essentially in his later epistles from that of his earlier. The conception in Thessalonians of death as a sleep does not

1. Kennedy - St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things, p.263.

2. 1 Thess. 5:2; 4:16-17; 2 Thess. 1:6-10. 3. Col. 1:5; 1:23; Eph. 1:18; 4:4.

4. 2 Cor. 5:10. 5. Rom. 6:20; 13:11-12. 6. Rom. 14:8.

7. 2 Cor. 5:8; Phil. 1:23.

8. 1 Thess. 4:13-15; 5:10; 1 Cor. 15:51.

rule out the possibility that those who die "in Christ" are living somewhere with and "in Him." Thus, there is no conflict between this and Paul's thought in his later epistles. Neither does the belief that immediately at death the apostle passes into the presence of Christ necessarily imply also a disregarding of the Parousia hope.¹

The apostle belonged to his day and generation, and shared its thought of the Parousia and resurrection. Picturing his future mystical fellowship "with Christ," he borrowed for his framework from these. For his central theme, he turned to his present mystical fellowship with Christ, "in Christ." This was the greatest of all certainties for Paul, and he believed that neither life nor death could rob him of such. Life "in Christ" could not end with death. It was this experience of life "in Christ" which assured the apostle of immortality and life "with Christ," not the Parousia and resurrection conceptions of his day. After death, life "in Christ," became a more glorious life "with Christ."² His apocalyptic expectations and view of the resurrection might be the variables of his thought, if they varied at all. His conception of life "in Christ" never changed. With the passing of the years, it deepened and became richer. At death this life "in Christ" was crowned and completed with life "with Christ."

E. The Holy Spirit.

1. The Cross and Resurrection.

Paul's thought of the Holy Spirit, like all his other conceptions, was profoundly influenced by his thinking about the cross and resurrection, and

1. Michael - Philippians, p.58.

2. 2 Cor. 5:10; Phil. 1:23; 1 Thess. 4:17; 1 Thess. 5:10; Col.3:4.

his experience of the Divine love revealed in them. The apostle regarded the Spirit of God as dynamic love. At Calvary, God made known His will to save, His love in Christ.¹ In the resurrection, the dynamic love of God or His Spirit was at work, raising Jesus from the dead and exalting Him to the right hand of God.² In the cross and resurrection, the redeeming outgoing love of God was active.³ Man's response was faith. By faith this Spirit of God was received, and in man's heart this Divine redeeming love became operative.

2. Faith, "In Christ," "In the Spirit."

Earlier in this chapter,⁴ it had been pointed out that faith brought the believer into mystical fellowship with Christ. This relationship was so intimate that the apostle's character was refashioned in the likeness of Christ. From this union, there was born in his soul a new moral power which transformed him into the image of his Master. This he must attribute to his risen Lord and Redeemer, and he describes it as the work of the indwelling Christ. Faith permitted this to take place within the soul of the apostle. It made him a man "in Christ." In Paul's thought of the Holy Spirit, faith also has a central place. God creates faith in the believer's heart;⁵ He also gives the gift of His Spirit.⁶ Faith enables the apostle to receive this,⁷ and permits the Spirit to dwell in his heart. Having received this indwelling Spirit by faith, he experienced a new power for righteousness, a power not his own, but of God.⁸ Paul describes this condition as being "in the Spirit."⁹

For the apostle, the experience of being "in Christ" and "in the Spirit" are synonymous. They both arise from the apostle's mystical faith union

1. Rom. 5:8.

2. Rom. 1:3.

3. Rom. 5:5-11.

4. p. 38-39.

5. Rom. 12:3.

6. Gal. 3:5.

7. Gal. 3:14.

8. Rom. 15:16.

9. Rom. 8:9, 14:17.

with Christ; they are part of it. Faith, the apostle's response to God's redeeming love in Christ, had linked Paul in a mystical oneness with his risen Redeemer. In his soul there welled up a new principle of moral life which belonged to the exalted Lord. This is Christ's spirit and work, and he named it the indwelling Christ. On its complementary side, he viewed this experience as the operation of God's spirit in Christ, the activity of the Holy Ghost or indwelling Spirit. The apostle uses the mystical phrase, "in the Spirit," some nineteen times in his epistles, and in fifteen of these the formula is closely associated with the kindred mystical term, "in Christ."¹ For Paul, they are interchangeable. This is true also of the apostle's thought of such terms as, the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, and the Holy Spirit.²

3. "In the Spirit."

The apostle varies his description of the experience of being "in the Spirit." There are times when he is concerned to point out God's work in regard to it. God implants His Spirit in man, and this takes possession.³ The Divine Spirit or energy acts upon the life of the believer as a distinct objective power, and does its transforming work. The apostle also describes the experience of being "in the Spirit" psychologically. The human spirit is not dispossessed, but is rather heightened and spiritualized by the Divine Spirit. The latent possibilities of the former, once dormant, are now called into being by Christ or the Spirit of God.⁴ Thus the apostle's two seemingly divergent conceptions are but the result of looking at this experience of being "in the Spirit" from different points of view.

1. Rom. 8:9-10; Phil. 1:27, 2:1, Gal. 5:5-6.
3. Gal. 3:5; 2 Cor. 5:5; Phil. 1:19.

2. Rom. 8:9; 1 Cor. 2:10-16.
4. Rom. 8:16; 26-27.

The indwelling Spirit or Christ is a new dynamic, moral energy, a new principle of life in the believer.¹ It is a permanent possession. The apostle's body becomes a habitation for the Spirit of God.² The Spirit does not visit for a time and then depart, as in the thought of the earlier prophets and leaders of Israel.³ It abode in the heart of Paul. He lived by the Spirit and was guided by it.⁴ The Spirit's gift was sonship. It taught the believer the confession "Abba Father."⁵

4. Ethical Fruits.

Life, "in the Spirit" had tremendous ethical consequences. Faith, man's response to God and His redeeming love in Christ, enabled the Spirit of God or Christ to dwell in the human heart. A new principle of life, a new moral energy and power for holy living was thereby given to the believer. He was consecrated and sanctified by the Spirit;⁶ therefore he must walk "in the Spirit" and not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.⁷ He must live a life in complete opposition to the flesh.⁸ The Spirit was the source and sphere of moral and spiritual growth, especially in the likeness of Christ. Life "in the Spirit", just as life "in Christ", resulted in Christlike living and character; the Spirit of the Crucified pervaded the apostle's whole being, transforming it into the same image.⁹¹⁰

God's redeeming love had been revealed in Christ. Faith, which opened the door of the human heart to the love of God and the incoming of the Spirit, when it became active manward, did so after the Divine pattern and

1. 2 Cor. 3:6; 1 Cor. 15:4-5.
4. Gal. 5:25; Rom. 8:4.
7. 1 Cor. 6:11.
10. Phil. 2:1-11.

2. Rom. 8:9.
5. Rom. 8:15; Gal. 4:6.
8. Gal. 5:16.

3. 1 Sam. 10:10.
6. 2 Thess. 2:13.
9. Gal. 5:22-23.

manner. It expressed itself in a like love to man.¹ In Paul's thought, faith,² love, "in Christ and "in the Spirit " are very closely connected. This life "in Christ" and "in the Spirit," towards God it is one of faith; towards man it is one of love. For the apostle, God and Christ were love, and when their Spirit dwelt in Paul's heart, love dwelt there. Love was the first fruits of the Spirit.³ The apostle interpreted the Spirit by love.⁴ His life "in Christ" and "in the Spirit" was a life like that of the Crucified.⁵

5. The Church.

⁶
In the preceding pages of this chapter, it was noted that the apostle's more personal koinonia with Christ, life "in Christ", was also a social koinonia between him and his fellow Christians. The mystical phrase, "in Christ," was social in character as well as individual, and included within the mystical Christ - Paul relationship also the believers, "in Christ." Faith was a personal tie linking the believer in a mystical union with Christ, and it was also a social bond, for it became active towards man in love, uniting him with the followers of Christ. Thus life "in Christ" was both personal and social; the Christ-Paul relationship included the believers "in Christ." Life "in the Spirit", which was synonymous with life "in Christ", was likewise - it was social as well as personal. Within the fellowship of believers "in Christ," the body of Christ, the apostle experienced life "in the Spirit." In the Church, the Spirit of God, Christ or love, dwelt, making it a spiritual and organic unity.⁷ This was the social bond which knit the believers "in Christ" together. Love or the Holy Spirit, which took its rise in God's

1. Gal. 5:6.

2. Gal. 5:5-6; Eph. 3:16-21; Phil. 2:1.

3. Gal. 5:22.

4. 1 Cor. 12-13.

5. Rom. 14:15.

6. p. 43-44.

7. 2 Cor. 13:14.

great deed in the death and resurrection of Christ, abode in the hearts of the faithful, uniting them to form the body of Christ. This love or the Holy Spirit was that which made the Church of Christ a reality in the world. The believers, therefore, must always live a life of practical service to the Christian community, and ever remain in this fellowship of love.¹ In the koinonia of the brethren "in Christ", in the fellowship of the Spirit, they were ever in a fellowship of love.² The rite of baptism was the door by which the believer entered into this fellowship of the Spirit or love.³ At baptism he received the gift of the Holy Spirit.⁴

6. Eschatology.

In our examination of the mystical phrase "in Christ," it was pointed out that this term had a close kinship with the mystical apocalyptic phrase "with Christ." At death, life "in Christ" was crowned and completed with life "with Christ."⁵ The indwelling Christ or Holy Spirit, the redemptive power within the heart of the apostle which wrought its moral miracles, was a pledge and anticipation of this future glorious life.⁶ Life "in Christ" and life "in the Spirit" were not the full heritage of the sons of men, but only a foretaste.⁷

7. Controversial Points.

With scholarship, the apostle has ever been the centre of controversy, and this is especially true regarding his conception of the Spirit. It has been maintained by scholars⁸ that Paul identifies the living Lord with the

1. Eph.4:3. 2. Phil.2:1; Eph.4:3-16; 1 Cor. 12:12-13:13. 3. 1 Cor.12:13.
 4. Eph. 4:30. 5. p. 56-60. 6. 2 Cor. 5:5. 7. Rom.8:23.
 8. Deissmann - Paul, p.142; Bousset - Kyrios Christos, p.104-6, and others.

Spirit. There are two important passages which suggest such.¹ Bousset would insist that the apostle's Lord had no real relation whatsoever to the historical Jesus.² Thus the way is fully open for a Hellenistic interpretation of the phrases "in Christ" and "in the Spirit." The apostle interprets Christ by his thought of the Spirit. It is argued that present-day distinctions between the spiritual and material were not known in Paul's day, and that he shared with his generation the more primitive conception of spirit as semi-material.³ The Spirit was generally mediated through a rite or sacrament.⁴ When a man was possessed of the Spirit, he was metaphysically different. It is maintained that Paul regarded himself as such, and this is proven by the metaphysical and moral dualism of his thought of flesh and spirit.⁵ The apostle places the spirit in antithesis to the flesh.⁶ Reitzenstein finds Paul's dualism rather in his conception of soul and spirit.⁷ In this whole phase of the apostle's thinking he was influenced primarily by his Greek environment, and interpreted Christ by his thought of the Spirit. "In Christ" or "in the Spirit" was a semi-material or sensuous relationship, not personal.

Other scholars have rejected this whole position. The apostle did not equate the Spirit with Christ. "His aim on the contrary is to keep them distinct and his very phrase 'the Spirit of Christ' which brings them so closely together implies an effort to distinguish."⁸ In the apostle's eschatological/

-
1. 2 Cor. 3:17-18; 1 Cor. 15:45. 2. Bousset-Kyrios Christos, p.105; 2 Cor. 5:16.
 3. Virgil - Aen. VI. 724-726.
 4. Jackson and Lake - Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I. Pt. 1. p.326; E.F. Scott - Spirit in the New Testament, p.156. Most interpreters of the apostle in terms of Hellenism argue along these lines.
 5. Pfeleiderer-Paulinism, Vol. 1. p.201; Bousset-Kyrios Christos - p.120-123. Refer Chap. IV for Bousset's and Reitzenstein's interpretation of Paul in terms of Hellenism.
 6. Rom. 8:4-13; Gal. 3:3. 7. Reitzenstein-H.M.R. p.333-346., 1 Cor. 2:14; 15:44, 46.
 8. E.F. Scott - op.cit. p.182.

eschatological thought, the present life "in the Spirit" and experience of the Spirit are but a promise and foretaste of that fuller life "with Christ" and fellowship with Him.¹ The indwelling Christ or Spirit was the Spirit of the risen and exalted Christ, who would return shortly for the final consummation. Paul did not submerge the personality of the risen Lord beneath an impersonal Spirit. Christ then would not have been an object of faith and love. "Spirit therefore, does not interpret the nature of Christ, but the spirit is the spirit of Christ, is Christ himself and he gives it his own character."² The apostle thought of the Spirit in terms of Christ, not Christ in terms of the Spirit.³ He Christianized the Church's conception of the Spirit.

The contention also that Paul's thought of the Spirit was dualistic will not stand a careful scrutiny. The Pauline antithesis of soul and spirit was moral, not metaphysical.⁴ This is also true in regard to flesh and spirit. The apostle may have sharply contrasted the flesh with the spirit; he needed to in a pagan, immoral world; yet there is no metaphysical dualism. Neither the flesh nor the body is evil.⁵ Dr. Burton, in his searching examination of the whole subject, has shown that this metaphysical dualism was neither to be found in the apostle's thought nor in the Greek literature of his day or before.⁶ Dualism enters Greek thinking later. Dr. Porter has rightly traced Paul's thought of the flesh to the Rabbinic doctrine of his day. The evil impulse,⁷

1. Rom. 8:23.

2. Porter - The Mind of Christ in Paul, p.275.

3. Porter - op. cit. p.63-64.

4. Reitzenstein's theory rests upon two instances, 1 Cor.2:14-15; 15:44-46. Refer to Kennedy - St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p.135-149 for a full discussion and refutation of Reitzenstein's position; also Burton - Galatians, p.489, regarding soul and spirit.

5. 2 Cor. 4:10-11; 7:1; 1 Cor. 7:34; Gal.2:20; Philom.16; 1 Thess.5:23; Phil. 1:20.
6. Burton - Spirit, Soul, Flesh. Amer.Jour.Theol.p.413; - New Testament Word Studies; - Galatians, appendix, p.486-495.

7. Burton - Galatians, p.493-494.

"yecer hara", the source of evil, was not rooted in the flesh or body, but attacked man through these and found an entry there.

The apostle's thought of the Spirit is not Hellenistic. It is kindred with "and almost beyond doubt directly or indirectly influenced by the Old Testament usage of ¹"דַּיָּן." Sometimes he regarded it as an impersonal power; ² at other times, personal. ³ Most often the Spirit occupies a place in Paul's thought, midway between identity with God and personality distinct from God, being the "personalized power of God, operative in the spirits of men, not distinguishable in experience at least, from the heavenly Christ."⁴

8. Conclusion.

With the apostle, the activity of the Spirit was not just confined to tongues, ecstasies and other ecstatic forms, as in the thought of the early Church.⁵ He intended the work of the Spirit to cover the whole life of man, and especially, the moral.⁶ Thus he developed a truly ethical and religious view of the Spirit, of which the prophets had made only a beginning.⁷ He completely moralized his conception of the Spirit. Closely associating the Spirit with Christ, he interpreted the former by the latter; he Christianized the thought of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was the Spirit of Christ, the Spirit of God which had been at work in Christ and supremely in His death and resurrection. It was the dynamic, supernatural, moral, redeeming love of God which had been revealed in the Crucified and Risen Lord, and which through Him had gone out to men indwelling in them, working its redeeming purpose, creating

1. Burton - Spirit, Soul, Flesh, p.576.

2. 1 Thess.1:5; Rom.5:5; 2 Cor. 1:22.

3. Rom. 8:26; 2 Cor. 13:14.

4. Burton - Spirit, Soul, Flesh, p.579.

5. Acts 10:44-46; 2:1-15. Paul and ecstasy, refer p. 29.

6. Rees - The Holy Spirit, p. 93.

7. Wheeler Robinson - The Holy Spirit, Enc. Britt, Vol.II, p.684. E.F. Scott.-op. cit. p.27-30.

love or the indwelling Christ within. Interpreting the Spirit thus, the apostle saved Christianity from becoming, on the one hand, an emotional fanaticism or vague religiosity without moral meaning, and on the other hand, a traditional and legal religion only concerned with the teachings of Christ, looking to the past and not to the present.¹ Further he taught Christianity to link its thought of the Spirit with and interpret it in the light of God's mighty saving deed in Christ.

III. SUMMARY

This preliminary study has sketched the mysticism of the apostle. It is a faith and a Christ mysticism, an individual and a social mysticism. Closely related to the apostle's mysticism are his conceptions of the Church sacraments, his ethic, the Holy Spirit and his eschatology. His thought of these was determined greatly by his mysticism, and this took its rise in the cross and resurrection, but especially in the cross.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTER OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM

" I have been crucified with Christ, and it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me; the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me."

Gal. 2:20.

I. THE CROSS AND RESURRECTION

A. The Cross and Resurrection.

The cross and resurrection were the most tremendous facts in the experience of the apostle and in his thinking. They were regarded as the greatest of all God's acts in the history of humankind. Paul's mystical life "in Christ" finds its wellspring or source and dynamic in these. Therefore in his epistles, he is ever pointing his fellow Christians to the Crucified and Risen Saviour. There are at least ten passages¹ where he refers to the risen Lord, closely associated with the resurrection. Thirteen passages speak of the Crucified and Risen Lord, and some twenty-eight have the Crucified as their theme.² The cross, therefore, is alluded to forty-one times, and the resurrection twenty-three. These figures speak of the importance which the apostle attributed to the cross and resurrection, and the relative value of each in his thinking. The cross was primary.

Before Paul's conversion, face to face with the claims of Christianity, the cross and resurrection were the stumbling-blocks. After this crisis they became central, the cornerstones of the apostle's Christ mysticism. The truth of the resurrection made valid the claims of the cross.

1. Passages, not verses.

2. See --- appendix to this chapter for passages, Appendix B.

Transformed now from a stumbling-block, the cross became the focal point from which light streamed, lighting up all Paul's spiritual universe. Its ray revealed the hand of God in all and the redemptive meaning and purpose running as a golden cord through all Christ's life, death, resurrection, exaltation and return. Little wonder, therefore, that the apostle made the cross¹ his passion and evangel.

It was Paul who took the cross out of its Jewish setting and placed it at the very centre of his universe. The cross was the supreme link between God and man, and the great divide between mankind's past history and his future destiny. The apostle lifted the cross up and interpreted it in the light of Heaven. It was God's greatest deed. Mankind had sinned, and before God stood condemned. The Jew had had his law, and the Gentile his natural religion, but these had failed. Man was helpless, doomed.² All had sinned and had come short of the glory of God.³ The cross was God's remedy in the face of this desperate situation. In the cross, God made known His will to redeem men. God met this situation with the cross: the cross proclaimed⁴ to the Jew, God's righteousness; to the Greek, His wisdom. In the cross, God made Himself known as a God of redemption. At Calvary, God had saved when all was lost. The apostle was baffled by the mystery of the cross as all have been since his day.⁵ He attempted to draw aside the veil with many technical and theological arguments, but with little success. Behind these there is that which is timeless and of eternal truth. Herein the apostle threw

1. 1 Cor. 2:2; Gal. 6:14.

2. The argument of the first three chapters of Romans.

3. Rom. 3:23.

4. 1 Cor. 1:23.

5. Illustrating the inadequacy of most theories of atonement.

some light upon the mystery. God had done something in Christ for man, which the latter could not do for himself.¹ He had redeemed man, and His love and grace had impelled Him to do it. The cross revealed the redeeming grace and saving love of God.

B. Grace.

1. Emphasis upon Grace.

In the New Testament the word grace is to be found some 150 times and of these occurrences, no fewer than 100 are to be found in the epistles of Paul.² The word grace is a rich and much — used word with the apostle, and his pre-Christian life under the law and the unique manner of his conversion explain why it is thus. The apostle had trusted the religion of Judaism fully and found it wanting. He had tried to win salvation by works and merit, but had failed. The law gave way under his feet; further, he came into active conflict with it. Instead of a way to the good, it became a pathway to the evil. The law did not bring inner peace and quietude to the soul of Paul, but rather an experience of failure and guilt, and a consciousness of God's offended justice.³

At Damascus, a new revelation of God was given to Paul. He discovered in the Crucified that God was a God of grace. In his hour of need and desperation, God had drawn near to him. The old relationship with God, of law and merit, had passed away. Complete dependence upon God's mercy was the only basis upon which a man could build his life. In the hour of his conversion, the apostle surrendered himself to Christ and cast himself upon the

1. Rom. 5:8.

2. Manson - Grace in the New Testament; Whitley ed.-Grace, p.34.

3. Romans, chap. 7. Refer also to p.11-12.

grace of God. The experience which followed revealed to the heart of Paul that this grace had become operative outwardly upon him, bestowing salvation and a new status before God. Inwardly this grace became the dynamic in his heart, giving birth to redeemed character. Because of this, the conception of divine grace stands out in the forefront of Paul's thought.

The apostle may have been the first to have given grace so prominent a place in his religious thinking, yet he is not without forerunners. God's sovereign choice of Israel among the nations had revealed His favour towards¹ her. The establishment of the covenant had shown His unmerited good will.² The gracious love of God was the foundation of the prophetic religion, especially in Hosea, Jeremiah and 2 Isaiah. The thought of grace, therefore, is to be found in the Old Testament, but it is mainly latent or implicit. In Judaism, the word disappears.

In the teachings of Jesus, the conception of grace plays an important part. This is especially true in the parables of the Lost Sheep, Coin and Son, parables of Jesus' own life and mission. Behind Jesus' conception of His vocation and His devotion to His calling, there is the firm conviction that God is linked with it all, and that the gracious initiative lies with Him.³ Yet Jesus did not isolate God's grace and love from the other attributes of God. This was left for His apostle Paul to do. The manner of his conversion led Paul to emphasize these. In the primitive Church, there was but a hesitant and imperfect recognition of grace. The party of Stephen began

1. Is. 41:8

2. Deut. 29:13-14.

3. Mk. 9:37; 12:5; Matt. 15:24.

to speak in such language, and they thus formed a fitting prelude to the apostle.

It was left for the genius of Paul to place the word "grace" among the primary words in Christian vocabulary. He made it plain in Christian thought that man by works or merit could not be reconciled to God. The death of Christ had revealed that to man. Reconciliation was something "wholly other", which God alone could do. Only God could reconcile, and He had done this in Christ Jesus.¹ The gracious initiative lay with Him. God's grace was not merely the Divine attitude of favour or willingness to bless, but it was the Divine self-giving of God to men in Christ. God Himself had provided the means of reconciliation, thereby redeeming men.²

Face to face with God's grace in Christ, the apostle must describe such in superlatives. No other language would suffice. God's grace was an abounding grace,³ overflowing;⁴ it was a surpassing grace,⁵ exceedingly rich.⁶ The death of Christ revealed God's glorious grace; so richly had He lavished His grace upon men.⁷ By God's grace alone the apostle was what he was.⁸ At times Paul speaks of the grace of God, without mentioning the work of Christ.⁹ Again he links it with Christ. Most often this is the case, for Christ had revealed God's grace in all its fulness and glory.¹⁰ There are also occasions when the apostle only mentions the grace of Christ.¹¹

2. Thought of Grace.

Grace for Paul signified the generous love of God which had gone out to man in Christ, bestowing salvation on him. It implied that what saved man

1. 2 Cor. 5:14-21. 2. Rom. 3:23-24; 5:1-17; 2 Cor. 5:14-21. 3. 1 Cor. 15:10.
 4. Rom. 5:17. 5. 2 Cor. 9:14. 6. Eph. 2:7. 7. Eph. 1:5-8.
 8. 1 Cor. 15:10. 9. 1 Cor. 15:10; 2 Cor. 9:8
 10. Rom. 3:23-24; 5:1-17; Eph. 1:5-8; 2 Cor. 5:14-6:1; 1 Cor. 1:14; 2 Cor. 9:14.
 11. Gal. 3:6; 2 Cor. 8:9; 13:14; 1 Cor. 16:23.

was not something proceeding from himself or from his own nature or from his own will or effort, but something which God had done and which had been exhibited on the cross of Christ.¹ Grace was the will of God so disposed to man that it constituted man's life afresh on a wholly new basis, in a changed world where man was now free from sin. This will of God gave man the gift of the Divine Spirit, and made him the possessor of a supernatural life. To the apostle, grace is the foundation and presupposition of the Christian life. In his own personal case, it was grace which had called him to his apostleship, set him apart to go to the Gentiles,² and abundantly blessed his labours.³ It was grace which had admitted the Gentiles to the new Commonwealth of God.⁴

The term, grace, is also used by Paul not only in reference to its redeeming work without, but also within. The Divine dynamic or influence for holy living, newly born within the soul, confronted with the fact of Calvary was also due to God's grace. God's gracious initiative in salvation granted to man not only forgiveness, freedom from sin and a new status before God, but also a new power within for living along redemptive lines. God's grace touched the whole life of man without and within. It became effective within the human soul, conferring its gifts and blessings.⁵ Thinking thus, the apostle links his conception of grace with that of the Spirit. The "charismata", the gifts which the inworking of God's grace had bestowed within the human heart, were also the fruits of the indwelling Spirit.⁶ Thus, grace in the apostle's thinking is a word with a wealth of meaning. It speaks of the Divine initiative in Christ, which wrought its redeeming will without end within the whole life

1. Rom. 3:25-26.

2. Gal. 1:15-16.

3. Gal. 2:9.

4. Eph. 2:2-6.

5. Rom. 12:6.

6. 1 Cor. 12:4-11.

¹
of Paul.

C. Love.

1. Emphasis upon Love.

Love is the companion word of grace in the vocabulary of Paul. Just as with the latter, he lifted up the former, out of its place among the other attributes of God, and made it primary in Christian thinking. In God's great deed in Christ, the gracious initiative was with Him, and that deed was a deed of love. What amazed and thrilled the apostle was the fact that in the death and sacrifice of Christ, he had discovered the love of God. This is what is distinctive in Paul's interpretation of the cross of Christ. It was he who penetrated to this fundamental conception of God's action.² Here he was a spiritual pioneer. God was a God of grace and love. Damascus and his pre-Christian days preceding this experience explain why he especially regarded the cross thus.

In the thought of God as love, the apostle had predecessors. The Old Testament speaks of God mainly in terms of righteousness and justice, but there are times when it rises to that higher conception of love.³ This is especially true in Hosea;⁴ yet here it must be confessed that the thought "does not come quite up to the self-sacrificing, active, passionate level of love," as found in the New Testament. There is "no emergence of love as the one great supreme link between man and God, as at once the essence of the divine nature and the ideal of all human nature."⁵

The teachings of Jesus never refer directly to God as love or as

-
1. For a full discussion refer to Moffatt-Grace in the New Testament. Manson-op. cit. To the latter I am mainly indebted for help in this section.
 2. Moffatt- Love in the New Testament, p.135.
 3. Jer. 31:3.
 4. Hos. 3:11; 11:4.
 5. Moffatt- op. cit. p.16.

loving men. Just as in His thought of grace, so here also He does not set love apart from the other attributes of God. Dr. Moffatt¹ has rightly suggested that, in the gospels, it is implied rather than stated that God is love. When Jesus speaks of God as Father, He assumes that God is loving. God's forgiveness springs from a heart of love.

"And furthermore, Jesus taught God's love by his life no less than his words. The very ministry and mission of Jesus was the best proof that God in love was about to inaugurate the supreme order of bliss among men. Thus Jesus acted for God in seeking and saving the lost, in simplifying religion, in proving by his actions as well as by his words that the human individual had eternal value and possibilities for God and that however unlovely and loveless it might be, human life was worth loving."²

It was left for the genius of Paul to read the mind of Christ on these matters, not just literally, but deeply,^{and} to bring to light what was central in Jesus' thought of God and His own mission, as yet only implied, not fully expressed in words. It was left for the mind of the apostle to grapple with the mystery of the cross, and in the light of this to interpret the teachings, life, and mission of Jesus, and link all with the redemptive purpose of God. Having done so, Paul could only say that it was the gracious and loving will of God which had taken form in Jesus Christ, and had become active in His life, death and resurrection for the salvation of men. The sacrifice of Christ exhibited God's love face to face with man's sin. The cross revealed a God giving Himself to man.

Writing about this love of God and Christ, the apostle must also use superlatives in describing such, as he did regarding grace.³ So great was

1. Moffatt- op. cit. p.67.

2. " " " p.80-81.

3. p. 72-3-4.

God's love in Christ that Paul is certain that nothing in this world or the
 next would ever separate him from it. It was a great love with which Christ
 loved men. The love of Christ surpasseth knowledge.

At times the apostle speaks of the love of God without any direct
 reference to the cross of Christ. The believers are beloved of God. The God
 of love hath loved them. The God of love hath taught them how to love one
 another. Paul prays that the Lord may direct their hearts to God's love.
 The apostle can also write about the love of Christ, without mentioning the
 love of God. The believers have been beloved of the Lord. The love of Christ
 surpasseth knowledge. It was a great love with which He had loved them.
 Christ had loved Paul and had given Himself up for him. He had loved His
 Church, and His death consecrated her. The believers redeemed by Christ's
 love must also have the same love. They must love the brother for whom Christ
 died, because Christ loved him and them.

Most frequently Paul links the love of God with the sacrifice of
 Christ. It was Christ's death which taught the apostle that God was love.
 The believers were to forgive because God for Christ's sake had forgiven them.
 They must copy God, and live lives of love like Christ who loved and gave Him-
 self up as an offering and sacrifice unto God, for a sweet smelling savour.
 God proved His love by the death of Christ. That sacrifice justified and
 reconciled sinners. Through faith, that love flooded the believer's heart by
 the Holy Spirit.

At times the apostle describes the love of God as being in Christ

-
- | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1. Rom. 8:39. | 2. Eph. 2:4. | 3. Eph. 3:19. | 4. 1 Thess. 1:4:14: Rom. 1:7:28. |
| 5. Rom. 13:11. | 6. 2 Thess. 2:16. | 7. 1 Thess. 4:9. | 8. 2 Thess. 3. (Col. 3:12. |
| 9. 2 Thess. 2:13. | 10. Eph. 2:19. | 11. Eph. 2:4. | 12. Gal. 2:20. |
| 13. Eph. 5:25. | 14. Phil. 2:1. | 15. Rom. 14:15; 1 Cor. 8:12. | |
| 16. Eph. 4:32-5:1-2. | 17. Rom. 5:1-17. | | |

Jesus," ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ .". The phrase is identical with that of the mystical formula designating his faith union with Christ. God did not spare His own Son; Christ died and rose; nothing therefore can part us from Christ's love, or separate us from the love of God in Christ Jesus.¹ Elsewhere he writes, "God was in Christ reconciling...";² "the redemption in Christ Jesus..";³ "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus."⁴ "the working of his mighty strength which he wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead;"⁵ "eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ;"⁶ "the will of God in Christ;"⁷ "riches of his grace in Christ;"⁸ "blessed us with many spiritual blessings in Christ;"⁹ "promises in Christ;"¹⁰ "chosen in Christ."^{11.}

2. Thought of Love.

In the preceding pages, it has been pointed out often that the apostle regarded the Spirit, grace and love of God as dynamic in character. They were ever active. They went out from God and worked His redeeming will and purpose among men. The Spirit of God raised Jesus from the dead. It did mighty works within the lives of the believers. The grace of God went out to man, giving its gift of salvation, and creating within the Christian redeemed character. The love of God was at work in the cross of Christ, defeating sin and reconciling men.

The Jew thought of God as active in history, working out His eternal purpose.¹² Paul's conception of God is similar. The scripture passages quoted above illustrate this. God performs mighty works. His greatest deed is the death and resurrection of Christ. It is a very significant fact that the

L. Rom. 8:32-39. 2. 2 Cor. 5:19, A.V. 3. Rom. 3:24. 4. 2 Cor. 4:6, A.V.
 5. Eph. 1:19-20, A.V. 6. Eph. 3:11. 7. 1 Thess. 5:18. 8. Eph. 2:7.
 9. Eph. 1:3. 10. Eph. 3:6. 11. Eph. 1:4.
 12. Bevan and Singer - The Legacy of Israel, p.50.

apostle uses often the word power. "δύναμις" in speaking of the cross and resurrection, the Holy Spirit, and life "in Christ." The word of the cross is the power of God.¹ Christ is the power of God.² The gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation.³ God wrought His mighty power towards men when He raised Jesus from the dead.⁴ The risen Lord is alive by the power of God.⁵ The apostle seeks to know the power of Christ's resurrection.⁶ The Spirit of God works like a mighty power.⁷ The indwelling Spirit or indwelling Christ is a powerful moral dynamic within.⁸ Paul can do all things, "in Christ" empowering him.⁹ The apostle writing to the Ephesian church prays that the Spirit may possess them, that Christ may dwell in their hearts by faith, that they may be rooted and grounded in love, and know the love of Christ. Finally he concludes, speaking of that power that worketh in them.¹⁰

God had acted in Christ's cross and resurrection. His grace, love and Spirit had been at work, working out His redeeming purpose. His grace had gone out dynamically to men. His love had been at work in the cross. His Spirit, dynamic love, had raised Jesus from the dead. God's Spirit, the Spirit of Christ or the indwelling Lord, had taken up its abode in the lives of believers, a tremendous redemptive power, making all new, creating in the believers Christlike character and love. All was the result of the grace, love and Spirit of God which had worked mightily in the cross and resurrection, and continued to work in the hearts of men. The cross and resurrection were God's second and mightier work of creation.¹¹ This time it was creation on redemptive lines. The believers were new creatures, children of a new age and

1. 1 Cor. 1:18. 2. 1 Cor. 1:24. 3. Rom. 1:16. 4. Eph. 1:19-20.
 5. 2 Cor. 15:4. 6. Phil. 3:10 7. 1 Cor. 2:4; 1 Thess. 1:5; Rom. 15:19.
 8. Col. 1:29; Eph. 6:10. 9. Phil. 4:13. 10. Eph. 3:16-20.
 11. 2 Cor. 4:6; 1 Cor. 15:45.

dispensation.¹ A new world had been born, a new aeon had been ushered in. At the parousia, God's last work of creation would be completed,² and nature and human nature would be wholly made new.³ The cross and resurrection had ushered in this new age, and would bring it to completion. God had been at work in the cross and resurrection; His Spirit, grace and love had been the moral redemptive power in and behind them. The crucified and risen Lord continued this work of God's reconciling grace and love..⁴ "the love of God in Christ Jesus,"³ "God was in Christ reconciling...."⁴

II. PAUL'S FAITH OR CHRIST MYSTICISM

A. Response to Grace and Love.

The cross of Christ was the foundation of the apostle's life and thought. The grace and love of God in Christ the Crucified had conquered the rebel Saul, and made him a lifelong captive. God's grace and love were the most tremendous factors in the life of the apostle. They were all subduing in their power. Paul writes, "The life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave himself up for me."⁵ In his letters to his fellow Christians, page after page is filled with the message of the cross, and invariably this is followed by exhortation to Christlike living.⁶ The cross of Christ had captivated and enthralled Paul. He was the slave of the Crucified,⁷ and he sought that the believers should be likewise. "I appeal to you by all the mercy of God to dedicate your bodies as a living sacrifice consecrated and acceptable to God...."⁸ "You are not your own, you were bought for a price; then glorify God with your body."⁹ "I am controlled

1. 2 Cor. 5:17; Eph. 2:15. 2. Rom. 8:22-23; Eph. 4:24. 3. Rom. 8:32-39. A.V.
 4. 2 Cor. 5:19, A.V. 5. Gal. 2:20. Mfft. 6. Rom. 5-6; Eph. 2-4. 7. Gal. 6:17.
 8. Rom. 12:1-2. Mfft. 9. 1 Cor. 6:20. Mfft.

by the love of Christ convinced that as one had died for all, then all have died and that he died for all in order to have the living live no longer for themselves but for him who died and rose for them."¹

B. Faith Mysticism.

1. Character of Faith.

The self giving of God in Christ to men demanded the self giving of Paul to God. It meant a surrender of the whole personality. This was the apostle's only adequate reply. God's love had stooped in Christ to Paul. In doing so, it had kindled in the heart of the apostle a loving faith in Christ, Paul's response to God's approach. The apostle seldom uses the word, love, to describe his attitude to God and Christ.² It is rather faith in Christ. The apostle like his Master prefers trust or faith, in expressing the relation of the soul to God. Love was organic to it. Dr. Moffatt³ has rightly pointed out that Christianity, in choosing faith, saved itself from becoming a mere emotionalism. Faith implied knowledge, trust, service, obedience as well as love. It demanded "doing the will of the Father." Faith involved the intellect and will as well as the heart. It denoted a moral submission which might be missed in love. It preserved the vital elements of adoration and humility, that belong to a deep sense of indebtedness to God.

If, for the apostle, grace and love are Heaven's great words, faith is man's attempt at a fitting response. Faith implied a surrender, a casting of oneself completely upon Christ, creating a fellowship so intimate that it became a mystical oneness, a faith union. In the act of faith, the whole

1. 2 Cor. 5:14-15. Moffatt. 2. Rom. 8:28; 1 Cor. 2:9; 8:3; 16:22; Eph. 6:24.
3. Moffatt- op. cit. p.160-163.

personality- mind, will and heart- was transferred into a close relationship with Christ, a oneness wherein there was a union of personality with personality; in one sense they were distinct; in another, they were one. It meant the movement of the whole soul in adoration, love, trust, confidence to Christ, a movement which made the apostle one spirit with Christ.

Certain scholars have objected to this mystical interpretation of Paul's relationship to Christ. The most outstanding is Dr. Denney. He writes,

"The New Testament has much to say about union with Christ but I could almost be thankful that it has no such expression as mystical union. The only union it knows is a moral one; a union due to the moral power of Christ's death operating morally as a constraining motive on the human will and begetting in believers the mind of Christ in relation to sin."

Dr. Peake², in reply to Dr. Denney, has refuted his whole position. A moral union, an ethical harmony, cannot explain the mystical term, "dying and rising with Christ." It means more than "my life is no longer mine, it is Christ who lives in me."³ Had the apostle meant only a moral union, he would have used another term besides "ἐν Χριστῷ."⁴

For Paul, the word faith describes the relationship between him and his Lord. It is not necessary here to describe the various shades of meaning of the word, both noun and verb. Any New Testament lexicon or commentary on the epistles contains this. But it is important to note that four distinct ideas are denoted by "πίστις" in Paul's letters - (1) conviction or belief; (2) trust; (3) faith; and (4) faithfulness or fidelity. In like manner the verb "πιστεύειν" means (1) to be convinced or to believe; (2) to trust; (3)

1. Denney - The Atonement and the Modern Mind, p.255-6, Exp.8.

2. Peake - A Reply to Dr. Denney, p.43-62, Exp. 9.

3. Denney - Death of Christ, p.151.

4. Peake - Op. cit. p 62. See Appendix A for a full discussion of Dr.

Denney's, Dr. Peake's and the writer's own views regarding Paul's union with Christ.

personality- mind, will and heart - was transferred into a close relationship with Christ, a oneness wherein there was a union of personality with personality; in one sense they were distinct; in another, they were one. It meant the movement of the whole soul in adoration, love, trust, confidence to Christ, a movement which made the apostle one spirit with Christ.

Certain scholars have objected to this mystical interpretation of Paul's relationship to Christ. The most outstanding is Dr. Denney. He writes,

"The New Testament has much to say about union with Christ but I could almost be thankful that it has no such expression as mystical union. The only union it knows is a moral one; a union due to the moral power of Christ's death operating morally as a constraining motive on the human will and begetting in believers the mind of Christ in relation to sin."

²
Dr. Peake, in reply to Dr. Denney, has refuted his whole position. A moral union, an ethical harmony, cannot explain the mystical term, "dying and rising with Christ." It means more than "my life is no longer mine, it is Christ who lives in me."³ Had the apostle meant only a moral union, he would have used another term besides "ἐν Χριστῷ."⁴

For Paul, the word faith describes the relationship between him and his Lord. It is not necessary here to describe the various shades of meaning of the word, both noun and verb. Any New Testament lexicon or commentary on the epistles contains this. But it is important to note that four distinct ideas are denoted by "πίστις" in Paul's letters - (1) conviction or belief; (2) trust; (3) faith; and (4) faithfulness or fidelity. In like manner the verb "πιστεύειν" means (1) to be convinced or to believe; (2) to trust; (3)

1. Denney - The Atonement and the Modern Mind, p.255-6, Exp.8.

2. Peake - A Reply to Dr. Denney, p.43-62, Exp. 9.

3. Denney - Death of Christ, p.151.

4. Peake - Op. cit. p 62. See Appendix A for a full discussion of Dr.

Denney's, Dr. Peake's and the writer's own views regarding Paul's union with Christ.

to have faith; and (4) to entrust.¹ The fourth use of the word is seldom found
At times the usage suggests the first / ^{meaning} but most often the second and third.

From this word study and from the previous discussion, it is already evident that the mystical faith union which linked the apostle with Christ called into play the whole personality, mind, will and heart. The mind of the apostle played its part in this new relationship. Faith implied belief or conviction. It meant the intellectual acceptance of the gospel message that Christ was Redeemer, and that His death and resurrection were the saving acts of God.³ In this and in several other cases,⁴ faith is equivalent to being convinced or persuaded that something is true. God out of love had in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ forgiven man his sins, and had reconciled him to Himself. The apostle must believe that this had taken place, that God's redemption had been accomplished in Christ Jesus, and that by faith in Christ he shared in this redemption and the resurrection life of the risen Lord. But faith was much more than belief or conviction, for it involved the feelings and will as well as the intellect. If faith had been purely intellectual, it would have been only the starting-point of the mystical life "in Christ." On the contrary, the apostle regards faith not only as the beginning, but also the basic and permanent principle, the ground of his mystical union. Faith implies trust and loyalty, and brings into play the feelings and will also.

Paul's mystical life "in Christ," his faith union, called into play and required the activity of his will. God's love revealed in the Crucified was the greatest spiritual force, the most tremendous moral power which he had

1. Hatch - Pauline Idea of Faith, p.32. Refer for a full discussion of the apostle's conception of faith, to pp. 30-66.

2. Rom. 3:3; Gal. 5:22.

3. Rom. 10:9.

4. Rom. 6:8; 1 Thess. 4:14.

ever encountered. It released the trigger of Paul's will, and his whole personality was directed to moral Christlike living. The apostle's mysticism¹ was an ethical mysticism. Dr. Denney is right in his insistence that Paul's faith union was moral through and through. Many interpreters of the apostle fail to stress this, and in not doing so, they err greatly. Paul's faith union with Christ was not an emotionalism. One cannot call him an ecstatic. He was never carried away by flights of feeling, thereby losing consciousness and swooning into states of absorption and annihilation. The feelings and emotions of the apostle, his heart had come completely under the sway of the risen Lord. But that was not all. There was a great and penetrating intellect, a profound mind which had been given to the service of his Master, and there was also an unswerving will which had dedicated itself to Christ.

The apostle's faith surrender was also a surrender of his will. In identifying himself wholly with Christ in this mystical fellowship, he shared² Christ's attitude to sin and to God. He must be loyal to all for which Christ stood. Obedience and service must be rendered to God. The will of the apostle must be in moral harmony with the will of Christ and God. That will must dedicate the whole life to God and Christ,³ and this having^{been} done, the will of God⁴ would become operative in that life, working in and achieving its purpose. The faith of the apostle had behind it the all-subduing love of the Crucified which had taken captive his will as well as his heart and mind.

Paul's faith was a loving faith. Faith called into play not only the mind and will but also the heart. Writing to his fellow believers at Philippi,

1. See p. 183.

2. 2 Thess. 2:12.

3. Rom. 6:11, 13, 19. 4. Phil. 2:12-13.

he prays that God's peace may guard over their hearts and minds in Christ¹ Jesus. It has been noted already that the apostle chose faith and not love to express his relationship with Christ.² Very rarely he uses the word, love, to describe such.³ His word faith, so rich in meaning, includes this within it. One who found only superlatives adequate for describing the grace and love⁴ of God and Christ, could not but give in return a like love.⁵ The self giving of God in Christ demanded the giving of the whole personality of the apostle in return. This is what the apostle means by his word faith. It was a surrender, the casting of his whole life upon Christ. This mystical faith union which resulted was personal, spiritual, and moral in character, uniting the mind, will, and heart of the apostle with his exalted Lord.

2. Faith - Beginning and Ground of Mystical Life.

Faith was a gift from God.⁶ This faith inaugurated the mystical fellowship or life "in Christ."⁷ It carried the whole personality of the believer over to Christ and identified it with Him. Faith cast it upon the risen Lord. Faith not only created the mystical relationship with Christ; it was necessary for the continuance of such. The Christian's faith was permanent. As well as the origin, it was the ground of the believer's life. It was the mystical state in which he lived. Hence Paul exhorts the Corinthians to stand fast in the faith.⁸ Again he charges them to try themselves to see if they are in the faith.⁹ The life which the apostle now lives as a Christian is one which he lives in the flesh and by faith in the Son of God who loved him and gave himself for him.¹⁰ Faith is the means or channel through which Christ

1. Phil. 4:7. 2. p. 82. 3. 1 Cor. 16:22. Eph. 6:24. 4. p. 74-75.
 5. p. 77-78.. 6. Rom. 12:3; Eph. 2:8. 7. Eph. 1:13; Gal. 3:14; Rom. 13:11.
 8. 1 Cor. 16:13. 9. 2 Cor. 13:5. 10. Gal. 2:20.

abides in the hearts of Christians. Through faith they enjoy the high pri-
 vileges of the new age inaugurated by Christ, namely sonship and adoption,
 privileges which will be even greater with the consummation at the parousia.
 At times the apostle uses the phrase "in the faith." It has substantially the
 same idea as "in Christ." Hence, "to be in faith" is practically equivalent
 to the more common expression, "to be in Christ", and it means to be in a state
 of mystical fellowship with him. Paul infrequently speaks of the Christians
 simply as "the believers."

Although faith was of divine origin and the gift of God, neverthe-
 less it was not at first perfect or complete. There was room for growth, and
 this was unlimited. This mystical life, "in the faith" or "in Christ", was not
 static. It has the possibilities of tremendous development, for its goal
 and pattern were Christ. The lives of the believers within the Christian
 Churches which the apostle had founded, were testimonies to the fact that
 faith had the capacity to grow and mature. Such growth was the normal result
 of living "in Christ", and was to be expected in the case of all Christians.

C. Christ Mysticism.

1. The Risen Christ.

The apostle's faith mysticism has been rightly called also a Christ
 mysticism. With Paul, it is faith in Christ. He is the object of the apostle's
 faith. With Him the apostle shares that mystical faith fellowship which he
 calls being "in Christ." This is personal, inward and moral in character. It
 is a fellowship with Christ or the risen Lord, who is to the apostle a personal

1. Eph. 3:17; Col. 1:22-23. 2. Gal. 3:26. 3. Rom. 8:23.

4. 2 Cor. 13:5; 1 Cor. 16:13; Col. 2:7.

5. Hatch - op. cit., p.46. 6. Rom. 3:22; 1 Cor. 1:21.

7. Rom. 14:1; 2 Cor. 10:15; 2 Thess. 1:3.

object, worthy of receiving an adoring and loving faith, capable of sharing in a personal, moral fellowship.

Earlier in this study, it has been pointed out that many interpreters, especially those of the comparative religion school, have regarded the apostle as equating the risen Lord with the Spirit.¹ Paul borrowed from the Greek world of his day his thought of the Spirit. Spirit was for him a very highly attenuated form of matter, spiritual and yet material. He regarded Christ thus, and it was therefore possible for him to think of himself as being in Christ, and vice versa, of Christ as being in him.² Having not known the historical Jesus, he did not regard being "in Christ" as a personal fellowship with the living Lord. Some scholars describe it as a sensuous experience; others, a physical, hyperphysical.³ Deissmann has emphasized the local element in the apostle's thought.⁴

This explanation of the risen Lord as a non-personal, pneumatic atmosphere, and the experience of being "in Christ" as semi-pantheistic in character, rests upon uncertain foundations. It must be proven that the apostle equated Christ with the Spirit, a contention which is groundless.⁵ It must also be shown that Paul's thought of the Spirit is Hellenistic and not Hebraic.⁶ Thus far it has been held that the apostle was more indebted to the Old Testament than to the Greek world, thinking of the Spirit as a power which descended from God upon a man, working within the heart, creating ethical and spiritual

1. p. 65-68.

2. Hatch - op. cit. p.39,

3. Dieterich and Heitmüller; see Kennedy - op. cit. p.222.

4. Deissmann - op. cit. p.142, also Religion of Jesus and Faith of Paul, p. 171.

5. p. 85

6. See Chapter IV - origin of Paul's conception of the Spirit.

7. p. 66-68.

character. This Spirit as power was the Spirit of Christ, and Christ interpreted the Spirit for the apostle and not the Spirit, Christ. He, therefore, thought of it as dynamic love.

Further, the whole explanation falls to pieces when one attempts to fit it upon the many-sided and richly varied thought of the apostle's mystical life "in Christ." It will not do justice to the ethical and spiritual view of that relationship with the risen Lord. It cannot explain why Paul regarded it as so intimate, inward and personal, and why his whole personality shared in it, making it so sane, normal, and at the same time so passionate. The whole thought of the exalted Lord, ^{and} the apostle's eschatology and parousia are completely ignored. That is the difficulty which every interpreter faces, who does not allow Paul to speak for himself, but goes far afield and after much searching returns with what he believes is the key which will unlock the riddle, only to find that it will not do so.

The apostle's faith or Christ mysticism was personal in character. The risen and exalted Lord was the object of Paul's faith, a personal object¹ with whom he shared a mystical fellowship. This fellowship was the result of a surrender of the whole personality of the apostle to his risen Lord. It was a personal relationship established by an adoring trust in and absolute devotion to Christ. These facts are simply ignored when one claims that this risen Lord was a non-personal, pneumatic Christ. Christ is not just a pantheistic indwelling being; he is also the exalted Lord for whose return the apostle

1. It is true that in those days they did not hold such definite and clear-cut conceptions of personality as are held today; but such does not warrant the assumption that there was no thought of personality at all in the apostle's conception of the risen Lord. It was present, yet not expressed to the extent which we would do so today.

eagerly waits. This Christ is immanent and transcendent, indwelling and yet
 exalted.¹ The Lord who directs Paul's way,² whose will is his will,³ who gives
 the apostle permission to do things,⁴ is also the exalted One whom God raised
 up and enthroned at His right hand,⁵ and who will return in glory shortly.⁶ Most
 often Paul reserves the title Lord for the transcendent or exalted Christ, yet
 this Lord is one and the same with the immanent indwelling Christ. They are
 not separate beings. He uses the title Lord in his mystical formula "in the
 Lord",⁷ and it is equivalent to "in Christ." Here he thinks of the Lord as in-
 dwelling. One moment he can speak of the Lord as exalted, and the next as
 immanent.⁸

An immanent non-personal, pneumatic Christ would not have been wor-
 thy of that loving faith which the apostle lavished upon his Christ. Such a
 one could never have been the second party of a relationship so personal, in-
 ward and moral as Paul enjoyed. He speaks of this as a fellowship.⁹ In this
 relationship he is not equal with his Master. He is an apostle of Christ.¹⁰
 His favourite word in describing himself is "δοῦλος", bondman, servant.¹¹ He al-
 so calls himself the prisoner of Christ.¹² He belongs to Christ; he is the
 Lord's.¹⁴ He bears in his body the marks or brands of ownership.¹⁵ He writes to
 his fellow Christians of Corinth that they are unto God, the sweet fragrance
 of Christ.¹⁶ They are living apostles of Christ, written by God's Spirit.¹⁷

1. Weber - op. cit., p.231. He rejects the conclusion that Paul's thought of the Spirit is Greek. The apostle's view of Christ interpreted his view of the Spirit, p.224-225. Christ was personal, p.235; exalted yet indwelling, p.231. Paul's mysticism was a personal faith mysticism, p.235. His faith explained his thought of the mystical formula "in Christ," p.218.

2. 1 Thess. 3:11. 3. 1 Cor. 4:19. 4. 1 Cor. 16:7. 5. Rom. 8:24; Eph.1:20;
 6. 1 Cor. 16:22; Phil.4:5; 2 Thess. 1:7. (Col. 3:1.
 7. 1 Cor. 9:2; Eph.2:21; Phil.4:1. 8.1 Thess. 5:2;12. 2 Thess. 2:1; 3:4.
 9. 1 Cor. 1:9; Phil. 3:10. 10.Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 1:1; Eph. 1:1.
 11.Rom. 1:1; 1 Cor. 7:22; Gal.1:10. 12: Eph. 3:1; 4:1; Philem. 1, 9.
 13. Gal. 5:24. 14. Rom. 14:8. 15. Gal. 6:17. 16. 2 Cor. 2:15.
 17. 2 Cor. 3:3.

2. "In Christ" - Oneness, Inwardness of Relationship.

The faith of the apostle was of such a nature that it surrendered his heart, mind and will completely to the risen Christ. This faith cast the whole personality of Paul upon the living Lord, creating a fellowship or relationship so close and intimate that it resulted in a mystical union or oneness with Him. The apostle describes this union by the term "in Christ," "in the Lord." As yet the word Christian had not come to be used by the first believers. These terms "in Christ" and "in the Lord" coined by the apostle, were the only ones available. At times these mystical phrases are only the equivalent in meaning of the word Christian.¹ "I know a man in Christ."² Yet in most cases they have a fuller and richer content.³ They imply a vital relationship or fellowship with Christ, so close and intimate that it was a union. They describe a life lived by Paul, which was created by Christ, grounded and sustained by Him, a life whose goal was Christ. The word Christian would have to undergo a radical transformation, and its meaning become intensified and deepened before it would signify what the apostle's mystical phrases implied.

This faith relationship, this mystical union which the apostle shared with the risen Christ was so close and intimate that it became a oneness. They are two and yet one. This is brought out clearly by the verse, "...it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me; the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God..."⁴ Describing this experience one way, it might be said that the "I" or the personality of the apostle had been merged

1. 2 Cor. 9:2; 1 Thess. 5:12. 2. 2 Cor. 12:2. Refer also to appendix B.

3. To be "in Christ" generally signifies far more than is suggested by some scholars "simply to be a Christian." Strachan - The Individuality of St. Paul, p.183.

4. Gal. 2:20. Mfft.

and obliterated in that of his Master. Looking at it differently, one might claim that the "I" or personality still existed, but now was recreated in the image of Christ.

The apostle compares this mystical fellowship to a marriage relationship.¹ In the sight of God two persons are made one by marriage. This union is a spiritual marriage, infinitely more close and binding. "He that joins himself to the Lord is one with him in spirit."² There is one passage especially which brings out the closeness and intimacy of this union or oneness;³ "I yearn for you all with the affection of Christ Jesus himself." Lightfoot has admirably paraphrased the words.

"....Did I speak of having you in my own heart? I should rather have said that in the heart of Christ Jesus I long for you" and adds "A powerful metaphor describing perfect union. The believer has no yearnings apart from his Lord; his pulse beats with the pulse of Christ; his heart throbs with the heart of Christ."⁴

3. "In Christ" - Christ the Ground, Sphere of Paul's World.

The apostle's mystical phrases almost defy analysis. One might compare them to the atom of the physicist, which, when it explodes and breaks up, only presents a greater and more insoluble mystery. These mystical terms point back to a spiritual experience or life; they attempt to describe such. Words always fail to do this adequately. This is their limitation. And when one remembers also that we are dealing with a great soul like the apostle Paul, our task becomes an almost impossible one. To portray his experience and life with Christ, most often he uses the phrase, "in Christ." One could

1. Rom. 7:4. 2. 1 Cor. 6:17. Mfft.

3. Phil. 1:8. Mfft.

4. Lightfoot - Philippians, p.85.

not express^{this}/more briefly or compress^{it} into fewer words. Just two are used, yet how great and how rich in meaning.

One might approach the problem first from the more theological point of view. The apostle found help in the Old Testament conception of solidarity, in interpreting the redemptive work of Christ's death. He speaks of God as blessing the nations in Abraham. "In thee 'ἐν σοὶ' shall all the nations be blessed."¹ It was through Adam that sin entered the world;² therefore "in Adam 'ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ' all die."³ Adam and Abraham represented mankind, and through them God dealt with man. Christ was likewise, yet He differed from them in that He was central in God's plan of redemption. In Adam all men had sinned, for Adam's sin was a racial act and involved mankind. They must all die. "In Christ" all shall be made alive.⁴ The death of Christ was also a racial act.⁵ He was the second Adam. So completely did Christ identify Himself with man, was one with him, that His acts became man's. Christ died in man's stead. In His death, the race died and atoned for its sins, and was pronounced righteous by God.⁶

Because of Christ's great deed of love, the apostle felt that he could stand before God. But it was only "in Christ" that he dared to do this, not by works of the law or by merit. "In Christ" he had a new status before God. He was approved of God, "in Christ."⁷ In his letter to the Corinthian Church, he writes, "This is the God to whom you owe your being in Christ Jesus, whom God has made our 'Wisdom,' that is our righteousness and consecration and redemption."⁸ "In Christ" the Gentiles are fellow heirs and partakers of

1. Gal. 3:8, A.V. 2. Rom. 5:12. 3. 1 Cor. 15:22. 4. 1 Cor. 15:22.
5. 1 Cor. 15:45. 6. 2 Cor. 5:21. 7. Rom. 16:10. 8. 1 Cor. 1:30. Mfft.

the promises of God.¹ On no other foundation than Christ could the apostle build.² In suffering in man's stead, Christ was the ground of God's approval of man. In Christ, Paul was before God a redeemed son.

In the apostle's thought, closely allied ^{with} / this conception of solidarity is another which has been mentioned earlier.³ Paul, like all Hebrew thinkers, thought of God as active. The history of Israel was a revelation of God's redeeming activity. The death and resurrection of Christ were the greatest of His saving deeds. God's grace and love, His Spirit, dynamic love, had been at work in the cross and resurrection, working out the redeeming will and purpose of God for man. The cross and resurrection had not ended this.⁴ In the risen Lord, this work of salvation was being continued, and it would be completed at the parousia. Thus for the apostle, Christ's death and resurrection and the activity of the risen Lord revealed the mighty redemptive power of God at work.

Paul could only say that "...God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself..."⁵ There had shined in his heart "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Christ Jesus."⁶ The resurrection had been a manifestation of "...the working of his mighty strength which he wrought in Christ Jesus..."⁷ "In Christ", God's will had been revealed,⁸ the riches of His grace had been displayed;⁹ the promises had been fulfilled;¹⁰ mankind had been chosen¹¹ and blessed¹² "in Christ". God's eternal purpose had been realized¹³ "in Christ Jesus." There had been revealed in all its fulness "the love of God in Christ Jesus."¹⁴

1. Eph. 3:6. 2. 1 Cor. 3:11. 3. p. 79-81. 4. p. 42-43. 5. 2 Cor. 5:19, A.V.
 6. 2 Cor. 4:6, A.V. 7. Eph. 1:19-20. A.V. 8. 1 Thess. 5:18. 9. Eph. 2:7.
 10. Eph. 3:6. 11. Eph. 1:4. 12. Eph. 1:3.
 13. Eph. 3:11. 14. Rom. 8:39, A.V.

The cross and resurrection ushered in this wondrous redemptive era with all its spiritual blessings. The risen Lord continued it. Believers "in Christ" shared in it. God's grace and love, at work in the cross and resurrection and now active in the risen Lord, were experienced by all who were "in Christ." He was the medium in which these operated, the channel by which these flowed to men. "In Christ," the apostle lived the resurrection life of his risen Lord, and shared the blessings of that new redemptive age which the cross and resurrection had inaugurated.

Christ was the ground of the apostle's life before God. "In Christ" he became a member of that new redemptive order instituted by God, in the death and resurrection of Christ, and shared in its blessings. Christ was also the ground of the apostle's life among his fellowmen. He writes, "for to me to live is Christ."¹ Christ is his life.² His ways are in Christ.³

The mystical phrase "in Christ" and its equivalents describe the spiritual world or sphere in which the apostle lived. Christ was Paul's universe. His world, life and existence meant nothing for him apart from Christ. Christ was the object, motive, goal and inspiration of his life. Christ was his universe, its centre and circumference, its origin, ground and completion. Such was the wealth of meaning which the apostle compressed into his mystical phrase, "in Christ."

4. "Christ in me."

The formula "in Christ" and its kindred terms picture that mystical relationship which existed between the apostle and Christ. They describe its

1. Phil. 1:21, A.V.

2. Col. 3:4.

3. 1 Cor. 4:17.

extent and significance, and also its personal and intimate character. The companion phrase, Christ "in me", and its equivalents portray another side of this relationship. They open the window of Paul's soul and let us look within; they tell the psychological story. Christ is the apostle's world, not only without but also within.

In the cross and resurrection, God had wrought His second and greatest work of creation. This time it was on redemptive lines. A new redeemed world had been inaugurated. God would bring this to completion in and through the risen Christ. This was the work of the risen Lord. The apostle by his mystical faith union with Christ had become a child of this new era. "In Christ" he lived in this new age. He was a new creature¹ enjoying a new status; he was a son of God. Within, his world was also changed. God in Christ was also active here.

God's Spirit, His redeeming grace and love, released by the cross and resurrection and now active in the risen Lord, were completing God's plan of salvation. That wondrous love of God in the Crucified and now in the risen Christ created a like passion of love in the heart of the apostle. Paul called this faith. It was a loving faith, akin to the Divine love, lit by its flame and fed by it. It was moral and redemptive like the Divine love, transforming and fashioning in the likeness of the latter, especially the lowly and sacrificial love of the Crucified. So mightily did it recreate that the old Paul was no more. Within the new Paul, love or Christ abode; Christ dwelt in him.

God's grace was likewise dynamic in character and active for redemptive ends. Revealed in the cross and at work in the risen Lord, it touched

1. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15.

the lives of believers and created within, its grace gifts. These, the apostle called the "charismata."¹ In like manner, God's Spirit, dynamic love, whose power man beheld in the cross and resurrection and whose activity was now to be seen in the risen Lord, was working out God's will to redeem.

By means^{of} the mystical faith Christ-Paul relationship, the Spirit of God or the Spirit of the risen Christ became operative in the apostle's heart. It transformed Paul into its own likeness, that of God and Christ. So wondrous and thoroughgoing was the change that the apostle could only say, "it is no longer I who live, Christ lives in me."² This indwelling Spirit, the fruit of his mystical faith relationship with the risen Lord, Paul also named the indwelling Christ; "Jesus Christ is in you."³

After Damascus, Christ had become the passion of the apostle's life. He was the new object of his adoration and worship, not the law. Paul sought to know Christ,⁴ Christ and His crucifixion, and also His resurrection life. The knowledge which he sought was that which came from intimacy and love. He desired to know Christ in the sense of knowing His love and Spirit, letting Christ's nature pervade and transform his whole being, His love and spirit possessing the apostle and becoming his. He sought to know Christ with an inward knowledge by the mystical Christ-Paul relationship, to experience Him so fully within, that his old life would be dispossessed and Christ would dwell in him fully; "I travail till Christ be formed in you."⁵

This new redemptive order which the cross and resurrection had ushered in and whose boundaries the risen Lord was extending, included within its scope the apostle's world without and within. In his own heart, the Spirit that

1. Rom. 12:6. 2. Gal. 2:20. 3. 2 Cor. 13:5-6. 4. Phil. 3:10. 5. Gal. 4:19.
(Mfft.) (Mfft.) (Mfft.)

abode within, the indwelling Christ or love, was establishing it. These, the indwelling Christ, were the wellspring of his mystical life. The indwelling Christ, "Christ in me", was the inspiration, the dynamic, the transforming power of that life. The apostle uses the word "ἐνδυναμοῦν"; "For the rest my brethren be empowered in the Lord."¹ "I am strong in Christ who empowers me";² "I labour striving according to his working which works in me in power."³ The crucified and risen Lord was the source, the fountainhead of the apostle's mystical life. The mystical phrase, "Christ in me", reveals this.

God is the creator of this mystical life which the apostle lived. Paul always thought of God as the one who ever took the initiative. He had done so in Christ's cross and resurrection. He gave the gift of faith which made the mystical relationship possible. The mystical Christ-Paul fellowship was His creation; "God has made us what we are, creating us in Christ Jesus."⁴

5. Development of Mystical Life.

This mystical life was not static. It had the possibilities of endless growth and progress. The formula "in Christ" suggests this. The experience "in Christ" was a present actuality. It was also an ideal which must be more fully realized in the future. "...you died and your life is hidden with Christ in God... So put to death those members that are on earth... you have stripped off the old nature with its practices and put on the new nature which is renewed in the likeness of its Creator."⁵ Christ, the ideal of the apostle's mystical life, was one which could neither be outgrown nor transcended.⁶ Only in Christ could a man reach his full life. He laboured that Christ might be formed in his converts' lives.⁷ The apostle strove to set them

1. Eph. 6:10. Mfft. 2. Phil. 4:13. Mfft. 3. Col. 1:29. Mfft. 4. Eph. 2:10. Mfft. 5. Col. 3:3-10, Rom. 6:1-14; Eph. 4:21-25. 6. Col. 2:10. 7. Gal. 4:19.

(Mfft.)

"before God mature in Christ." Christ, especially Christ the Crucified, was the goal of all his endeavours. He sought to win this Christ, to know Him, the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, to be made conformable unto His death. He followed after Him. He pressed towards the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus. His great passion was that the likeness of the Crucified should come out in his mortal flesh.

6. This Mystical Life was Paul's normal Life.

The apostle's faith or Christ mysticism, his mystical life "in Christ" or "Christ in me", was very sane and normal. Paul was no ascetic. His thought may have been the soil from which the Church's metaphysical and dualistic conceptions sprang later, but the apostle himself did not entertain these. Paul's dualism was ethical, and not metaphysical. Flesh ($\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$) was the power which made for evil in man. The apostle did not regard this as a compelling force. Paul associated " $\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\iota$ " or this tendency to sin with the body ($\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$), but he did not identify it with the latter. The body was the gateway through which sin entered man. The flesh was hostile to God and His will, and must be crucified and put to death on the cross of Christ. Faith accomplished this for the believer. The life in the flesh could be therefore a life of faith and of victory over evil, for in faith there is a force to overcome the flesh in its worst sense. It was possible therefore, for Believers to live both in the flesh and in the Lord. The apostle made the life of Christ manifest in his mortal flesh. The fleshly as well as the spiritual of the believer's life must come under the lordship and the redeeming influence of Christ. They must therefore cleanse themselves from every thing that contaminates flesh or spirit.

-
- | | | |
|--|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Col. 1:28, Mift. | 2. Eph. 3:10-14. | 3. 2 Cor. 4:10-11. |
| 4. Refer to Burton - Galatians, Appendix p 493-494, also Peake, Quintessence of Paulinism, Bulletin, Rylands Lib., p.8-11. | | |
| 5. 1 Cor. 9:27. | 6. Gal. 2:20. | 7. Rom. 6:1-2, Gal. 5:16. |
| 8. Philem.16. | 9. 2 Cor. 4:10. | 10. 2 Cor. 7:1. |

This mystical life "in Christ" was lived in the body. Their
bodies belonged to Christ and God.¹ Christ was to be magnified in their mortal bodies.² The apostle's own body was a mirror of the crucifixion and the Crucified, the resurrection, the Risen Lord and His resurrection life; "always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus that the life also of Jesus may be made manifest in our body."³ If the apostle appears to be tainted with asceticism, this is due not to any metaphysical dualism, but to his apocalypticism, and especially to his passion for the cross and resurrection, to know these, to experience them, to taste the crucified life and resurrection life of Christ, and the redeeming grace and dynamic love of God in and behind them.

The apostle was not an ecstatic. His new life was a pneumatic life, a life "in the Spirit", but this was interpreted in terms of Christ. It was life "in Christ". He chose this latter term rather than the former to describe it. Life "in Christ" did not imply great ecstatic moments, periods marked by the ebb and flow of emotion, times when the apostle was not "in Christ" and again when he was "in Christ." Life "in Christ" for the apostle was of a completely different nature. Christ was his universe, his world without and within. Christ was his world without, that world of God, his fellowmen and himself. Christ had given him a new world. He thought of God now in the light of the cross and resurrection. The Crucified portrayed God for him. Through Christ the apostle beheld man, man perfected. The loving, sacrificial nature of the Crucified was the goal and completion of man. Paul

1. Col. 2:17, Rom. 12:1-2; 1 Cor. 7:34; 1 Thess. 5:23. 2. Phil. 1:20.

3. 2 Cor. 4:10, Mfft.

owed his own existence to Christ, especially as a redeemed child of God. "In Christ" all this was his. Christ also was his world within. The world of his heart, mind and will had undergone a new creation. This had been the work of Christ. These were no longer his - they were Christ's. Christ dwelt therein, "Christ in me."

Christ was the source, the ground and goal of the apostle's life. The whole gamut of that life had come under Christ's sway. Nothing was excluded. This was an actuality, and also an ideal yet to be achieved. Therefore, the apostle writes to his fellow Christians that their hearts and minds were to be in Christ Jesus.¹ They were to have the mind of Christ.² Christ's thoughts should be their thoughts.³ They were to love with the heart of Christ.⁴ Christ was their life.⁵ They were to lead their life in Him rooted and built up in Him.⁶ Their ways were in Him.⁷ Every action and activity was related to Him.⁸ They laboured,⁹ rejoiced,¹⁰ gloried,¹¹ were proud,¹² certain,¹³ weak "in Christ."¹⁴ The lordship of Christ continued even unto death, "if we live we live to the Lord, and if we die we die to the Lord. Thus we are the Lord's whether we live or die." At death the lordship of Christ did not cease. Life "in Christ" became life "with Christ."

God's redeeming grace, love and spirit had been at work in Christ's death and resurrection. In the risen Christ they were active. Christ's death and resurrection had inaugurated God's new redemptive age, and the risen Christ was bringing this to completion. He was the object of the apostle's faith, a personal Christ. He shared with Paul a mystical faith relationship,

1. Phil.4:7. 2. Phil.2: 11. 3. 1 Cor. 2:16. 4. Phil.1:8. 5. Col.3:4, Phil.1. 6. Col. 2:6. 7. 1 Cor. 4:17. 8. 1 Cor.15:58. 9. Phil.4:4. 10. Phil.1:26 (:21. 11. Rom.15:17. 12. Rom.14:14. 13. 2 Cor. 13:4 -- There are some 68 passages covering every phase of the apostle's life. Refer to Appendix B. 14. Rom. 14:8-9. Mfft.

a union which was personal and moral, so intimate and close that it was a oneness. The apostle defines this fellowship or union by the phrases "in Christ" and "Christ in me." The former term is more descriptive of Paul's spiritual world without. Christ's crucifixion and exaltation had ushered in a new era. "In Christ" the apostle became a citizen of this, enjoying a new status before God and sharing in its spiritual blessings. God's grace, love and spirit revealed in the Crucified and now active in the risen Lord became operative in Paul's life, as he lived it "in Christ." Christ was the ground of the apostle's life in relation to God. He lived "in Christ." God was the creator of this life. Christ was the ground of the apostle's life in relation to men. Life "in Christ" covered the whole gamut of Paul's life. This life was a present actuality and also a future realization. Christ was its goal. The mystical phrase "Christ in me" is descriptive of the apostle's inner world. God's redemptive order had been born and was being established within Paul's own soul. Christ had brought this to pass and He was bringing it to completion. He was the source and wellspring of the apostle's inner life. All had taken its rise in the cross and resurrection.

III. HISTORY MYSTICISM.

A. Jesus and Paul.

Since the days of Baur, Holsten and Pfleiderer, it has been fashionable to hold that Paul knew but little of the historical Jesus. The comparative religion school developed this position further. Bousset, possibly the most outstanding of its representatives, maintained that the apostle knew not,

nor was he concerned with the historic Jesus. Paul's mysticism was therefore a relationship with a heavenly being. The living Christ which the apostle knew had no connection with the Jesus of Palestine; a great gulf separated the two. This position has not been without opponents in the past¹, and today it is less popular.² Further, investigations have shown that the apostle was well acquainted with the earthly life of Jesus.³ The real problem is not that Paul so rarely quoted Jesus' words or referred to his earthly life, but that he so often agreed without any real literary dependence.⁴

Paul's knowledge of Jesus is personal,⁵ not biographical. The Jesus of Paul is not a literary tradition, but a living person. The Christianity of Paul is not a new legalism based upon the teachings of Jesus, but a life "in Christ," a mystical fellowship with the living Lord, who had lived on earth, been crucified, and had risen. In the Fourth Gospel, there is what appears to be a new movement within the early Church. The writer seeks more fully to bring to the fore, to re-evaluate and reinterpret the human and historical personality of Jesus.⁶ The synoptic gospels had begun this. The Fourth gospel completed it. This was not a new movement contrary to Pauline thought, but rather an emphasis of that which was implicit in Paul. The apostle may have had his eyes focussed upward upon the risen Christ and also forward to the Lord of glory who would return. But this did not prohibit him from turning them backward to the Jesus of history, and especially to His lowly life of

-
1. J. Weiss, op.cit., claims that the apostle knew Jesus in the days of His flesh.
 2. Refer to chapter IV for a full discussion of the arguments of the comparative religion school.
 3. Porter - The Mind of Christ in Paul, p.17-41. Dr. Porter has ably shown the fallacy of this former position.
 4. Enslin - The Ethics of Paul, p.116.
 5. The Jesus who converted Paul was the living Lord of the first Christians, revealed not so much in their teachings but in their lives.
 6. Strachan - The Historical Jesus in the New Testament, p.10.

love and self-sacrifice.

All his epistles testify to this. As Wernle has well said, "Paul never knew Jesus during his lifetime, but nevertheless it was he who best understood him."¹

"He knew him as person knows person, with a knowledge which is not history nor science, nor philosophy, but friendship. He knew him as one in whom humility and love were revealed, not only in their divine beauty, but in their divine power. He confirms the truth of the general impression of the personality of Jesus which the gospels give to those who seek in them for Jesus himself."²

The apostle's thought of the risen Lord and indwelling Christ had as its firm foundation the historic life of Christ. The apostle's mysticism is a history mysticism.³

B. The Cross and Resurrection.

In Paul's letters, there is especially the backward look to the cross and resurrection of Christ. These are the pivot points about which all the apostle's thinking and life turn.⁴ They were God's great deed in history for man's salvation. In them, God acted upon the stage of time and revealed His will to redeem. They were the revelation in time of God's atoning work. The risen, exalted, and living Lord was not another person distinct from the historic and crucified Christ. He was one and the same. The life, mission, death, and resurrection of Jesus, as well as the redeeming work of the risen Lord, His return and final consummation—all constituted the intervention of God at a point in time, in the world's history, for the salvation of men.

1. Wernle - The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I. p. 159.

2. Porter - op. cit. p. 41.

3. Weber - op. cit. p. 235, uses this apt phrase quoting from Soderblom in Tiele's Kompendium der Religionsgesch, 1912, S. 224.

4. Refer to the apostle's many references, Appendix B.

God's racial act in Christ at Calvary must also take place in the soul of the apostle. Christ had defeated the power of sin, death and the elemental spirits, and had paid in full the claims of the law. The old regime of law, daemons, sin and death had come to an end. A new redemptive age had been born with the resurrection of Christ. By faith, the apostle was crucified to this old world, had died and was buried. He shared Christ's crucifixion, death and burial, and for him this old world passed away; "...the cross of Christ, by which the world has been crucified to me and I to the world."¹

Paul also rose with Christ, sharing in His resurrection and risen life, now enjoying fellowship with the risen Christ in this new redemptive age. Thus the apostle availed himself of the blessings which God had placed at man's disposal by the death and resurrection of Christ. At baptism, the believer experienced this also, dying and rising with Christ. "Our baptism in his death made us share his burial, so that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, we too might live and move in the new sphere of Life. For if we have grown into him by a death like his, we shall grow into him by a resurrection like his..."²

This experience of mystically by faith sharing in the death and resurrection of Christ was a daily happening. The new redemptive era had only begun. The activity of the risen Christ directed it to its goal. The parousia would complete it. The life of this new age, life "in Christ", would become life "with Christ." By daily dying and rising with Christ, this came to pass. There was a dying of the outward man and the renewal of the inward, and this

1. Gal. 6:14. Mfft.

2. Rom. 6:4-5, Mfft.; Col. 2:12-3:1.

transition was without break to the immortal life. "...wherever I go I am being killed in the body as Jesus was, so that the life of Jesus may come out in my mortal body; every day of my life I am being given over to death for Jesus' sake, so that the life of Jesus may come out within my mortal flesh.. Hence I never lose heart; though my outward man decays, my inner man is renewed day after day...I know that if this earthly tent of mine is taken down, I get a home from God made by no human hands eternal in the heavens."¹ This experience is conditioned by faith. The apostle's mystical faith relationship with Christ, life "in Christ," is a fellowship also with Christ as crucified and risen, a faith fellowship with His death and resurrection.

Behind the theological conceptions connected with these mystical phrases, there is another more spiritual, and therefore of more value for our day. Calvary was a deed of love.² God's grace and love had been active, reconciling man to God; they had been at work in the cross and resurrection, in the Crucified;³ "God was in Christ reconciling..;" "the love of God in Christ Jesus."⁴ God's dynamic love had been active in Calvary and the resurrection. The cross and resurrection were the passion of the apostle's life, because they were the supreme revelation of God's grace and love. By mystical fellowship with Christ in His death and resurrection, the apostle experienced these. Dying and rising with Christ, Paul died to the old life of sin and of self, and rose to a new resurrection life pulsating with God's holy, dynamic love. Calvary and the resurrection marked a new era, wherein God's love and grace had been poured out upon the children of men. Enacting the drama of the

1. 2 Cor. 4:10 - 5:1. Mft. 2. See -- p. 76-80.

3. 2 Cor. 5:19. A.V.

4. Rom. 8:32-39. A.V.

cross and resurrection in his own life, he became a child of this new age, and these possessed the heart of the apostle.

C. Fellowship of Christ's Sufferings.

Christ's life of suffering as well as His crucifixion marked the outpouring of God's love and grace. Paul therefore sought the fellowship of Christ's sufferings,¹ and held up the lowly and self-sacrificing life of his Master as the only pattern for his converts to follow. It is true that behind this passion for fellowship with Christ's sufferings, there is also the apostle's theological thought that Christ by His sufferings and crucifixion brought to a close the old regime of law, daemons, sin, death. By fellowship with Christ's sufferings, Paul put an end to their reign in his life. The old man² belonging to this old era was crucified. Most commentators stress this interpretation.

It is the opinion of the writer that this does not do full justice to the apostle. His theological ideas belong to the outer circle of his thinking. They were not the central dynamic of his life. One must turn from his rabbinic modes of thought to that conviction born at Calvary that God was holy love. The resurrection and the risen life of Christ showed forth that triumphant love powerfully at work. The cross and sufferings of Christ revealed that love giving of itself. Its self-giving was the secret of its triumphant power.³ The cross had taught the apostle the paradox of Christianity; "whosoever wants to be first among you must be your slave..;"⁴ whosoever loseth his life...shall save it."⁵ On these matters, the apostle had the mind of

1. 2 Cor. 1:5, Rom. 8:17. 2. Rom. 6:2-12. 3. 1 Cor. 1:23.

4. Matt. 20:27. Mfft. 5. Matt. 16:25. Mfft.

¹
Christ, and here one has moved from the outer circle of Paul's thought to the very centre, the inner springs of his being. He therefore lived, like his Master, a life wherein the self died daily. He sought to share the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, that he might experience in his own heart that triumphant holy love which had been released upon humankind by Christ's sufferings, cross and resurrection.² Paul's cross and resurrection mysticism had not only Calvary and the resurrection as its pattern, but also the cross-bearing life of Christ.

V. SACRAMENTAL MYSTICISM

The apostle's sacramental mysticism also begins at Calvary. It has as its centre the cross of Christ. Paul is the only New Testament writer who makes the cross and resurrection the pattern of his baptismal experience. It is a baptism of death and resurrection. The believer is united mystically with Christ by faith, and shares His crucifixion and resurrection. In the apostle's thought of the Lord's Supper, the cross is also central. Paul is the first³ to emphasize the memorial aspect of the feast. He is also original in his interpretation of the sacrament after the same manner as the rite of baptism. The believer shares a mystical partnership or fellowship with the Crucified.⁴ Both rites are conditioned by faith on the human side, thereby making their sacramentalism not magical but moral.

VI. ETHICAL MYSTICISM

A. Faith Mysticism

1. Porter - op. cit. This is the thesis of Dr. Porter's book and he has ably proved it, making his book a classic.

2. Phil. 3:10.

3. Refer to Chapter IV for a full discussion.

4. Col. 2:12; Gal. 3:26-27.

When discussing the question of the apostle's faith mysticism,¹ Dr. Denney's view² was mentioned. Denney claimed that Paul's fellowship with Christ was a moral union only. The thesis of this inquiry is rather that it was a mystical union. Here we disagree with him, and yet we also agree when we claim that it was an ethical mysticism. Faith according to the apostle involved the activity of his will. Faith in Christ implied a complete surrender of the whole personality to Christ. It was the will which was the deciding factor in this; it dedicated the heart and mind of the apostle to his Master. This will pledged his life to Christ and Christlike living. Paul's mystical faith union with Christ was especially a union of his will with Christ's.³ He shared Christ's attitude to sin and to God. His mystical faith relationship was a moral relationship.

B. Christ Mysticism.

1. "In Christ."

The apostle describes his Christ mysticism⁴ most often by the formula "in Christ." This term is moral as well as mystical in meaning. Paul shared a mystical faith fellowship with the risen Lord. This was so close in nature, so intimate and inward that it was a oneness.⁵ The personalities of Christ and Paul were merged into one, and yet they were distinct. It was not an absorption. The apostle was "in Christ." In discussing this mystical relationship from the standpoint of faith, it was pointed out that the apostle's faith fellowship was thoroughly moral. This mystical faith fellowship can also be called a mystical Christ-Paul relationship or oneness. It was a mystical oneness which was moral to the core. Christ's moral personality had transformed the

1. p. 81--85.

2. p. 82.

3. Rom. 13:14; Rom. 12:1.

4. p. 91-97.

5. p. 91-93.

apostle's. It had dispossessed Paul's.¹ He was now "in Christ."

The mystical phrase "in Christ" describes the spiritual ground or sphere of the apostle's life.² Living "in Christ", he belonged to a new redemptive era which had been ushered in by the cross and resurrection. These had heralded the inbreaking of God's wondrous grace, love and Spirit. In the risen Christ, they were active, and that age was moving to its fulfilment. The parousia would mark the completion of this era. In mystical fellowship with Christ, living "in Christ," Paul became a child of this new age and was himself a new moral being. "There is a new creation whenever a man comes to be in Christ; what is old is gone, the new has come."³ Life "in Christ" had ended that old world of law, sin and death, known so well to Saul the Pharisee, that legalistic relationship with God, and that life of moral failure before God. Living "in Christ", the apostle lived in a new world. The God of law was now the God of grace. Grace reigned in this new world. Living according to God's will, which formerly had been impossible, was now attainable. "In Christ", the apostle was in the sphere of a new moral redemptive power. Therefore Paul had put on Christ.⁴ "In Christ", this revolutionary moral change in his world and in his life had come to pass.

The phrase "in Christ" represented for the apostle, the present mystical and moral life which he lived. Ideally this was already fully his. In actuality it was yet to be achieved. He writes to his fellow converts, "Now in the Lord you are in the light, lead the life of those who are children of the light."⁵ The mystical formula "in Christ" symbolized the final goal of

Mift.

1. Gal. 2:20; Eph. 4:21-24.

2. See pp. 92-96. 3. 2 Cor. 5:17; Gal. 6:15.

4. Gal. 3:26-27.

5. Eph. 5:8; Mift., Rom. 13:14.

the apostle's moral strivings. His mystical life "in Christ" was morally progressive; Christ was the ultimate object of all his endeavours. "For his sake I have lost everything ..in order to gain Christ and be found at death in him."¹

2. "In the Spirit."

The mystical term "in the spirit" is a companion phrase of the mystical formula "in Christ."² Although the latter is the favourite expression of the apostle, the former is used, and most often in close relation to the latter. Paul Christianized the conception of the Spirit. He "let Jesus himself interpret the conception of the spirit."³ This made him the great prophet of the new Christian doctrine of the Spirit. Paul thought of the Spirit in terms of Christ, His cross and resurrection, and especially His cross.

The cross and resurrection marked the new activity of God's redemptive power. The cross had released God's grace, love and Spirit in the world of man, and a new world had been born, a world of redemptive love. This saving activity of God was continued in the risen Christ. "In Christ" the apostle was also "in the Spirit"; he was in this world, pulsating with God's dynamic redemptive love. He lived in a new moral realm, his whole being the object of God's outpouring Spirit or love or the activity of the Spirit of Christ.⁴

The apostle held also a psychological view of the Spirit. As well as operating upon a man from without, it found lodgment within and continued its redeeming activity. Calvary's love had given birth to a new moral power within the apostle's heart. This love had power to recreate its own moral likeness.

1. Phil. 3:8-9, Mfft.

2. See-- p. 60-61. For discussion of the apostle's thought of the Spirit, p. 60-68

3. Porter - op. cit., p. 83.

4. Rom. 8:26-39.

Before God, Paul's life became fashioned after the pattern of the Crucified. Unto his fellowmen, the apostle rendered a lowly sacrificial love like that of his Master. In Christ or in the Spirit, this moral transformation took place.

The cross of Christ more than all else had led the apostle to come to this truly ethical, spiritual, and Christianized conception of the Spirit and of life "in the Spirit." The life, death, and resurrection of Christ were God's great deed of love. There was no greater moral power in Paul's universe than this love. There was no experience more wonderful or miraculous ^{than} / possessing that power in his life, to be beloved of God and Christ, and to love others after the Divine pattern. Therefore the apostle thought of the Spirit in terms of the Crucified and His redemptive love.

3. "Christ in me."

The mystical formula "Christ in me"¹ pictures that world within the apostle's own soul, and the transformation which had taken place because of his mystical fellowship with Christ. The phrase describes psychologically that mystical life "in Christ." Living in mystical fellowship with the crucified and risen Christ, his whole being surrendered by faith to Him, the apostle became transformed into His moral image and likeness. Paul's personality became dispossessed by that of Christ's. The apostle describes this moral change by the phrases, putting on "the new nature,"² putting on "the character of the Lord Jesus Christ,"³ "put on Christ."⁴

The apostle analyses even more psychologically than this, his mystical life. The former description portrays this moral transformation as a process

1. See-- R. 95-99.

2. Col. 3:3-10.

3. Rom. 13:14.

4. Gal. 3:26-27.

beginning without and working until the whole inner man is changed. Paul also describes it as beginning within and working out from this centre. Calvary was the greatest moral and redemptive power in the apostle's universe. God's grace, love and Spirit, released by the cross and resurrection and active in the risen Lord, had become operative in his life. He was conscious, therefore, of a new power working for righteousness, which had come to dwell in his heart. There was a new dynamic, which enabled him to live after the pattern of Christ and according to the will of God. The apostle must attribute this new moral power or dynamic to God and Christ. He names it the Spirit of God or Christ, love or the indwelling Christ; "...if Christ be in you the body is dead on account of sin but the spirit is living..."¹ It was as if Christ had been born in the apostle's heart, and had grown to such a stature that he had replaced all else, and especially sin. This indwelling of Christ and forming of Christ in Paul² was a profoundly moral as well as a mystical experience.

C. Cross and Resurrection Mysticism.

1. Dying and Rising with Christ.

³
This mystical phrase is closely related to the apostle's theological thought. Christ's racial act at Calvary must also be enacted in Paul's own life. He must die with Christ to daemons, law, sin and death, and rise with Christ to share His resurrection life. Since Christ's death and resurrection had won for men a moral redemption, the apostle's experience of dying and rising with Christ was also moral. Ideally Paul regarded this transformation as having taken place already. In actuality, this moral miracle was yet to be

1. Rom. 8:10. Mfft.

2. Gal. 4:19.

3. See - p. 106-109.

achieved,"...you were buried with him in your baptism and thereby raised with him... So put to death those members that are on earth, sexual vice, impurity..¹

Behind these theological conceptions is that spiritual conviction that Calvary and the resurrection were God's great deed of love. This love was the most tremendous moral force in the apostle's world. Face to face with the cross, a like love was born in Paul's heart. Enacting the drama of Calvary in his own life, he made that love the great moral dynamic of his life.

2. Fellowship with Christ's Sufferings.

The apostle's theological conceptions partially explain also the mystical meaning of this phrase. Christ's sufferings, as well as His death and resurrection, ushered in a new redemptive age. Suffering mystically with Christ, Paul brought to a close in his own life, this old era. This experience was ethically conditioned. There is also the thought of living a moral redemptive life of lowly love and self-sacrifice like that of his Master.

D. Sacramental Mysticism.

The apostle's sacramentalism can only be understood in the light of his faith mysticism. If this is not done, his sacramentalism becomes an erratic boulder² in his thought. There is a unity in his thinking, when one recognizes that his faith mysticism explains his sacramentalism, making it a sacramental mysticism conditioned by faith.³ During the performing of the rites, Paul experienced a mystical faith fellowship with Christ crucified and risen. Since his mystical faith fellowship with Christ was moral, these experiences were likewise. The apostle's faith was strengthened and more fully spiritualised.

1. Col. 2:12 - 3:5; Mift., Gal. 3:24-27.

2. Heitmüller; Holtzmann; Weinel - see Hatch, op. cit. p.85. Refer to Chapter IV for a discussion of these controversial points.

3. Col. 2:12.

Through communion with Christ, the apostle's life became more Christlike. These were the ethical fruits of the sacraments; "you are all sons of God by your faith in Christ Jesus (for all of you who had yourselves baptized into Christ have taken on the character of Christ)."¹ The apostle's sacramental mysticism was an ethical mysticism.

VII. DEVELOPMENT OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM

The question of the development of Paul's mysticism is a very difficult one. The apostle uses the mystical formula "in Christ" three to four times more often in his later epistles than in his earlier. One might conclude from these figures that development can be readily traced. The answer to this question cannot be arrived at by so simple a method. A statistical analysis of the apostle's mystical phrases used in each epistle and a comparison are not sufficient. Paul's letters are not primarily statements of belief. They are not treatises unfolding his thought, epistle by epistle, the earlier revealing some positions which he finally abandoned, the later containing his most mature thought.

His epistles were all written to meet certain specific situations which had arisen in the different churches founded by himself. The character of each letter was determined by the situation. Since each church had its own problem, demanding a certain solution, the apostle's epistles were not uniform, some more theological, others more mystical. In the Thessalonian epistles, Paul is facing the question of the parousia expectation. His letter to the Romans is more doctrinal. Galatians deals with the practical problem

1. Gal. 3:26-27, Miff; 1 Cor. 10:7-8; 11:27-29.

of the law and circumcision. Here he is fighting on behalf of the Gentiles and their inclusion within the Church of Christ. The Ephesian and Colossian epistles strike at the heresy of disunion among the Jews who would withdraw from their Gentile brethren, thus endangering the unity of the Church. These epistles are among the most mystical of his writings, for their theme is the Church of Christ, one of the greatest of the apostle's mystical conceptions.

It is futile to attempt to trace a gradual and consistent development in Paul's mystical thought. The character of the apostle and of his letters does not furnish such. Consistency was not one of his weaknesses. One cannot find a consistent development in his eschatology.¹ This is true also in regard to his theology and mysticism. Such conclusions do not rule out completely the possibility of development. There was growth, but the apostle's great mystical conceptions come from Paul the poet, rather than Paul the thinker. They were the product of moments of great vision and intuition, rather than the fruit of years of laborious thought.

There is evidence of the enrichment of the apocalyptic mystical phrase, "with Christ." In the later epistles a more intimate note is present. "My strong desire is to depart and be with Christ, for that is far the best;"² "...for you died and your life is hidden with Christ in God."³ The mystical conception of "dying and rising with Christ" makes its appearance first in the middle epistles.⁴ The mystical formula "in Christ" is to be found in the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians more often than in Paul's earlier

1. See Eschatology, especially p. 59.

2. Phil. 1:23, Mfft. 3. Col. 3:3, Mfft. 4. Rom. 6:2-12, Gal. 6:14.

letters. The apostle is dealing with the mystical conception of the Church. This explains the increased use of the term. It also does away with the contention that Paul's mysticism was corporate in character and not personal. It has been claimed that if, in the earlier epistles, such was not fully the case, Paul finally came to this position in his later epistles, after his more mature insight had dwelt upon this conception.¹ On the contrary, even in these later letters, where the theme is the Church, the personal mysticism of the apostle is to be found also.²

It has also been maintained that the catholic or universal thought of the Church found in these later epistles, replaced the more local conception of his earlier and middle letters. In reply, one needs only to repeat the assertion again that Ephesians and Colossians are concerned with the Church universal. And even this being the case, there are to be found two references to the local church.³ It is true that one finds in these epistles the apostle's most spiritual and enriched mystical conception of the Church. Here he adorns it with metaphor and simile not found in his earlier epistles. It is to the Paul of these letters that Christianity owes most for one of its most treasured conceptions of the Church of Christ.

The epistles of Paul do show a development in his mystical thought, an increase of depth and richness. Yet it is also well to remember that, in his earliest epistles, most of his mystical conceptions are to be found full grown. In his later epistles they reach their full maturity. The apostle's letters to the Thessalonians contain his mystical conception of the Church as

1. Sanday and Headlam - Romans, p. 123.

2. Eph. 4:17; 6:21; Col. 1:28-29.

3. Col. 4:15-16. See Burton - Galatians, p. 417-420 for a complete discussion.

abiding in Christ.¹ He as an apostle, charges and exhorts,² begs and beseeches them,³ and presides over and disciplines;⁴ but his authority comes from being an apostle "in the Lord" or "in Christ." The normal life of a follower of Christ is life "in the Lord."⁵ Life after death is described by the apocalyptic mystical formula "with Christ."⁶

VIII. SUMMARY.

This chapter has been concerned with the character of the apostle's mysticism. This was determined greatly by the cross and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and especially the former. In them, Paul beheld the redeeming activity of God's Spirit, His grace and love going out to man. The apostle's answer to this gracious and loving approach of God in Christ was a faith surrender of his heart, mind and will, a mystical faith union, a faith mysticism. Since it had been "in Christ" that God had drawn near, this faith union, this faith mysticism was also a faith fellowship with Christ, a Christ mysticism. Christ was the apostle's new spiritual world without; He was also his spiritual world within. The mystical formula "in Christ" and its equivalents describe the former. They portray Christ as the sphere or ground of Paul's universe. They also picture the oneness and inwardness of his mystical fellowship with Christ. The mystical formula "Christ in me" and its companion phrases describe the apostle's spiritual world within. Christ is the dynamic, the wellspring of this new mystical life. God is the creator of it all. This mystical life is capable of infinite development. Life "in Christ" is both a present actuality and a future realization. Christ is the ideal, the goal. This mystical life "in Christ" is sane and normal, lived in the body and in the

1. 2 Thess. 1:1. 2. 2 Thess. 3:12. 3. 1 Thess. 4:1.
 4. 1 Thess. 5:12. 5. 1 Thess. 3:8. 6. 1 Thess. 4:16-17.

flesh, and it covers the whole gamut of the apostle's activity and life.

The apostle's mysticism was also a history mysticism. It had for its historic foundations the intervention of God in the world's history for purposes of redemption. This had taken place in the life, death, resurrection, and activity of the risen Christ, and would be completed at the parousia. His mysticism was also a Cross and Resurrection mysticism. He sought to experience in his own life not only the redeeming activity of the risen Lord, but also the death and resurrection of Christ, and the fellowship of His sufferings during the days of His flesh. Paul's conceptions of the baptism and the Lord's Supper were both sacramental and mystical. His was a sacramental mysticism, but since it was conditioned by faith, it was one with and the same as his faith or Christ mysticism. The faith of the apostle is that which gives unity to the variety of his mystical thought. All had as its basis, this faith. Because of this, every aspect of his mysticism is thoroughly ethical. This faith was Paul's answer to the cross and God's grace and love revealed in it. His mysticism, therefore, had as its centre Christ risen, and especially Christ crucified.

.....

CHAPTER IV

FORMATIVE INFLUENCES DETERMINING

PAUL'S MYSTICISM

"...the study of his relation to Judaism and Hellenism has its rightful and necessary place, and its own rewards; but it is not easy to keep it in its place... Our need is to know not the man of his time, but the man, Paul himself, as Christ made him after his likeness."

F. C. Porter.

I. PRE-CHRISTIAN DAYS, CONVERSION, EARLY CHURCH, JESUS, AND THE OLD TESTAMENT

A. Pre-Christian Days.

1. Bankruptcy of Judaism.

It has been the claim and one of the main arguments of this inquiry that, for an understanding of the apostle's mysticism, one must turn to his pre-Christian life in Judaism under the law and its failure, to the Christianity of the first Christians to which he was converted, and to the unique character of his conversion. These days aid in explaining the birth and character of his mysticism. In insisting upon this, one is not maintaining that these alone solve the riddle of Paul. The solution to this riddle is not so simple. One claims only that they contribute greatly towards doing such.

Deissmann and others have put forward the suggestion that the apostle was a mystic even before his conversion. His mysticism was a God mysticism, "being in God,"¹ inspired by the Septuagint, especially the Septuagint Psalms. Deissmann finds evidence for this in Paul's speech on Mar's Hill. "...for it is in him (God) that we live and move and exist."² This is an echo of his pre-

1. Deissmann - Paul, p. 146.

2. Acts 17:28, Mfft.

Christian, Jewish, God mysticism. His conversion at Damascus transformed this into a Christ mysticism. In the opinion of the writer, the evidence is¹ far too slender to substantiate such a theory.

Further, if one grants that the apostle was a mystic in his pre-Christian days, then why did his conversion to Christianity take place? Would not a God mysticism have satisfied him sufficiently? On the contrary, the combined evidence of the epistles and Acts points to a pre-Christian life which was far from being mystical. Saul of Tarsus was a child of legalistic Judaism, and to this he gave complete allegiance. With the bankruptcy of this religion within his soul, he discarded it completely for Christianity. This alone explains the presence of antitheses in his epistles — darkness, light; old, new; law, grace; works, faith. Much would be unintelligible otherwise in his letters — the new inwardness and mysticalness of the apostle's Christian life; the definition of a Christian as a new creation; the complete abandonment of the law; the new and tremendous emphasis upon the Divine grace and love, the cross of Christ and faith. The emergence of these within Christianity due to Paul must have an adequate explanation. This is to be found in the failure of his pre-Christian religion, the Christianity of the first days to which he was converted, and the unique character of his conversion.

2. Testing Judaism face to face with Christianity.

-
1. Two other passages, Gal. 3:8; 1 Cor. 15:22, seem to suggest a pre-Christian mysticism, but it is more likely that these belong to his post conversion period. Schweitzer - The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p.14, rules out the whole possibility of a God mysticism. Paul's thought of God was too transcendent to permit such an immanent view. Following Norden and Holtzmann, he claims that the Aeropagus speech was the creation of the author of Acts. The writer is in agreement with Schweitzer's criticisms.

The religion of Judaism gave way completely under the apostle's feet, simultaneously with the dawning in his soul of the truth of Christianity's claims and their implications. The gospel of a crucified Messiah, who had died for man's sins and who would return shortly to judge the world, was very revolutionary. It did not take the apostle long to realize that Christianity was not just a branch of Judaism. On the contrary, Christianity was its most dangerous foe. This new gospel threatened to undermine the very foundations of Judaism. There could be no compromise. The vindication of the claims of one denied those of the other. It was a question of either Judaism or Christianity, law or grace, faith or works, righteousness by the law or righteousness through Christ.

The whole issue narrowed down to the question of the cross. Was the cross a scandal, or the power of God unto salvation; was the gospel of a crucified Messiah a blasphemy or the saving story of God's great redeeming act in Christ? Even though Judaism had been tested and found wanting, the apostle's path leading to Christianity was blocked; greater obstacles lay in his way. There was the truth of the resurrection story which had to be brought home to the apostle's heart. There was especially the tragedy, the scandal (*σκάνδαλον*), and the anathema (*ανάθεμα*), of the cross. This emblem of Divine rejection and punishment had to be transformed into a symbol fraught with Divine meaning, revealing God's eternal will and purpose to redeem men.

B. Paul's Conversion.

1. Outer Facts of the Cross and Resurrection.

The Christianity of the first Christians, not so much what they taught, as what they lived, removed the almost insurmountable obstacles blocking the path of the apostle, and won him to Christ. The followers of Jesus were living commentaries on this new religion. From them Paul received both the outer and the inner facts about Christ and Christianity. Their gospel would tell the story of Jesus' life, His atoning death, His resurrection and eagerly expected return to usher in the Kingdom and judgment.

2. Inner Facts of the Cross and Resurrection.

Of greater importance was the fact that these lives were also commentaries on the inner story of Christianity. Their Christlike characters mirrored the inner life of Jesus, His faith, Spirit, lowly love and self-sacrifice. They threw light upon the tragedy of Calvary and dispelled some of the darkness surrounding it. Persecutions and martyrdoms like that of Stephen would shake the few remaining foundations of Paul's religion, and force him again and again to face the claims of the cross. Stephen's Christlike prayer of forgiveness, his undying faith and his spirit of triumph in the face of death, would vindicate the gospel of a crucified Messiah. The cross was not God's judgment and curse, His condemnation of Jesus' Messianic claims. On the contrary, it was central in His plan and purpose to redeem men.

The lives of the first Christians were also commentaries on the inner facts of the resurrection. They were testimonies to the resurrection age, which the infant Church claimed had been inaugurated by the cross and resurrection. The hope of the prophets had been fulfilled; the long-promised Messianic era had been born. God's redemption had come to pass. They were

living in a new age wherein God's Spirit had been poured out upon men. Their lives testified to a new experience of God, a new sense of sins forgiven, a new inner dynamic and power, a new joy and freedom.

These lives proclaimed also the fact of the resurrection itself. God had raised up Jesus and exalted Him. He would return shortly. In the interval, He was active extending His Kingdom. The early Church which Paul was persecuting testified to this. Contrary to the expectations of the Jews, the cross had not dealt a death blow to the Christian faith. It flourished the more. The first believers were knit together in a *koinonia* or fellowship so close that they were of one heart, one mind, and one spirit. One purpose possessed them. The cause of Jesus had not ended with Calvary; His mission in the days of His flesh was but a prologue to this more glorious Messianic age now inaugurated. In the *koinonia*, in the infant Church He lived on, fulfilling the work begun during His lifetime. Christ lived on not only in the Christian fellowship but also in each believer. The martyr Stephen was proof of this.

With the bankruptcy of Judaism within the soul of Paul, he became an eligible convert to Christianity. His campaign of persecution brought him into close contact with the first Christians, and made this a possible happening. The scandal of the cross and the impossibility of the resurrection were the obstacles prohibiting this. With the removal of these, Paul joined the ranks of Christianity. The lives of the first Christians, living commentaries on the cross and resurrection, were mainly responsible for this. These commentaries gave the outer facts, thereby lessening the intellectual doubts harboured/

harboured by the apostle and winning the approval of his mind. They also gave what was of greater value, namely, the inner facts, which captivated his heart and moved his will to dedicate his whole personality to Christ.¹

C. These days determine the Character
of Paul's Mysticism.

1. Faith or Christ Mysticism.

On the great and central questions of religion the apostle is one with his Master, but he differs in the expression of these. The explanation is to be found in those days preceding his conversion and the crisis itself. He lays greater stress upon certain aspects. Certain phases are thrown out into relief. His epistles are noted for their antitheses. In his pre-Christian days, while a protagonist of the law, the issue had been Judaism or Christianity. After his conversion it remained the same, only now he had cast his fortunes in with the latter. He was the protagonist of the Gentiles, and the bitter foe of Judaism. God had relegated Judaism to the past; it belonged to the old dispensation. The apostle's Christianity rested upon absolutely new foundations, it was a new structure, its language was entirely new.

Christianity is indebted mainly to the apostle for some of the greatest words in its vocabulary - grace, love, faith. These take their rise in Jesus, but it was Paul who first gave them such prominence. The language and thought of Judaism would not suffice. These had been tried and found wanting. Paul's language and thought knew no kinship. He had made a complete break with the former. Further, he was now absolutely opposed to all, and he did not

1. This and the preceding pages of this chapter are a resumé of pages 5-20; refer there for scripture passages. Then, it was hoped that the discussion would throw light upon Paul's conversion, now, reveal the soil in which his mysticism was rooted.

hesitate to use Judaism as a background for displaying the attractiveness and superiority of Christianity. His epistles are filled with contrasts of Judaism and Christianity, revealing the weakness of the former¹ and the superiority of the latter.

Paul's pre-Christian crisis and conversion had fitted him and him alone to discern the marked differences in the primary beliefs of Judaism and Christianity. Judaism rested upon legal foundations. Man's relationship to God was statutory. Obedience was imposed from without, by law. Divine approval was won by works of merit. Life was a balance sheet. Man's chief concern was to keep a surplus of merits on the credit side. The apostle was the first to point out in no uncertain terms that the character of Christianity was quite the contrary. The religion of Stephen and of the first Christians, to which Paul had been converted, was no new legalism. In discarding the law, they had come ^{into} conflict with Paul. Their religion became the basis of the apostle's Christianity; what was latent or implicit there, he brought to light and made explicit.

Paul's religion was not a legal agreement but a personal relationship. This relationship demanded a surrender of the whole man, the heart, mind, and will of the apostle. Partial adherence to the minimum of a code of law might satisfy the requirement of Judaism. That was one of the reasons why Judaism could not hold captive such a nature as Paul's. With the apostle, religion must claim and reign supreme over his whole personality. Christianity did

1. The apostle was one who knew; he had given the religion of his fathers a more than fair trial; he had served Judaism as few had done (Romans contain echoes of his loyalty to her; in the epistle he struggles to vindicate her and passionately seeks to win her back even though she had rejected Christianity); he had not given up Judaism without a bitter struggle.

this. Central in Christianity was the fact of God's self-sacrifice, which demanded the same of the believer. Nothing would suffice but the complete surrender of the whole life.

Judaism, having made the keeping of the law central, was therefore a religion of external, statutory obligations. Obedience was imposed from without. The apostle's religion, on the contrary, was extremely inward. The will of God was obeyed because of the inward impelling of love in Paul's heart. God's gracious and loving will had been revealed in the cross; therefore it had power to create within man a like love and will.

The religion of Judaism was formal, cold and heartless. The religion of the apostle was emotional, passionate, of the heart. On the Divine side, there were those great words, grace and love, which Paul must use with superlatives. In those passages in his epistles where he is discussing such themes, argumentation is abandoned; the apostle's thought rises to great heights, and ends in raptures and Te Deums.¹ Grace and love were the golden cords which bound the apostle to the Divine. On the human side, there was the word faith, so rich in meaning for Paul. Faith implied love. Love was organic to it. It was of the mind and will, but it especially sprang from the heart. Faith was the only word adequate for the apostle to reply to the Divine language of grace and love.

Paul had tested Judaism and found it wanting. Its legalism, externalism and formalism had failed to satisfy. In turning to Christianity, the apostle found there what Judaism had failed to give. ^{As a of} /result/ his experience within the ranks of Judaism, Paul discovered in the religion of the first

1. Rom. 8:31-39; Gal. 3:14-21.

Christians that personal and passionate character, that inwardness with which Jesus had endowed Christianity. The early Church had inherited this from its Founder. This was the religion of the first Christians, though by no means had it reached maturity. The apostle made it the distinctive mark of his own Christianity, and he compressed it all into one word, faith. Faith implied a personal, inward and passionate fellowship with Christ. Paul's religion was a faith mysticism. Thus the lives of the first Christians were not only commentaries on the cross and resurrection but also on the Christianity of the first days itself. They not only removed the barriers which prevented the apostle's conversion from taking place, but more important still, they offered¹ the apostle a religion which after his conversion he made his own. His

1. In the past, scholarship has been too much occupied with the differences between Jesus and Paul, especially where it concerns the latter's theology. Today it is greatly indebted to Dr. Porter, for he has proved that in the central matters of religion, Jesus and Paul were in complete agreement. Here, the apostle had the mind of Christ. A more difficult problem remains, how came this to be? Time separated Paul from Jesus; who bridged this gulf dividing the two? The first Christians supply the answer. The apostle was converted to their Christianity, not so much to their intellectual beliefs but to the Christian life they lived. In the inner circle of Paul's own Christianity, one does not find a system of beliefs - apocalypticism, theological speculations, etc, but rather a faith or Christ mysticism, a life "in Christ." The religion of the first Christians was the parent of this. It is difficult to note fully what were the characteristics of this religion. Unfortunately Acts is our only source. Already we have discovered how unreliable Acts is as primary data, in dealing with the question of the resurrection and Paul's conversion. In the past, Acts has been used in a too careless and literal fashion. Too much attention has been paid to the miraculous, the abnormal and the Spirit phenomena. It is not the task of this inquiry to investigate this whole question, but it is the conviction of the writer that a careful study would yield a different and more spiritual estimate of the Christianity of the first days. It is true that the apocalyptic hope was one of the dominant notes. There were others. One sees evidence also of a personal, inward and passionate fellowship with the risen Lord, exalted and yet very near - the words of the dying Stephen, Acts 7:59-60; the passionate prayer of the early Church, 1 Cor. 16:22. This religion had great kinship both with Jesus and Paul; it was worthy of converting the latter and of being the parent of his Christ mysticism.

experience with Judaism, his conversion crisis, and his genius enabled him to note well Christianity's distinctive marks and stress those characteristics given to it by Jesus.

This view is further substantiated on inquiring into the origin of the apostle's Christ mysticism. His pre-Christian experience with the law, his hatred and persecution of Christianity, and the religion of the first Christians were important factors in the moulding and shaping of its character. While a protagonist of the law and a bitter enemy of the first believers, the issue had been for Paul, Judaism or Christianity. His ardent defence of the former revealed also his bitter hatred of the latter and all that pertained to the name of Christ. During those days immediately preceding his conversion, the apostle made two startling discoveries. Within his own life, Judaism had been tested and was found wanting. In the lives of the first Christians, he beheld the inner facts of Christianity and Christ — their Christ-indwelt lives and that unity or fellowship of the believers in which Christ abode and carried on His mission.

Following his conversion a radical change took place in Paul's life. What he had hated, now he treasured; what he had held dear, now he discarded. Christianity completely replaced Judaism, especially that Christianity mirrored in the lives of the first Christians. The first believers were knit together in a fellowship, a oneness which persecution could not stamp out. On the contrary, it grew and flourished. This fellowship was pledged to Christ, was dominated by His Spirit, and was completing His work begun during the days of His flesh. Christ was risen; this fellowship was evidence of such. He

lived on in it. Here one finds the beginnings of the apostle's mystical conception of the Church. These first believers were all one "in Christ" and Christ in them.

The Christianity revealed in each individual life was also the soil out of which Paul's personal mysticism sprang. Lives like that of Stephen testified to the resurrection. He was a child of that new age inaugurated by the resurrection. He belonged to that new era of redemption instituted by the cross. He had shared in that new outpouring of God's Spirit upon men. Stephen belonged to Christ; he lived for Him; His Spirit possessed and inspired him; Christ lived on in him. The apostle later described such a life as being "in the Spirit," "in Christ" and "Christ in me." Christ was the wellspring, dynamic, inspiration and ground of it. Paul defined Christianity as life "in Christ." The first Christians before him had done likewise, only not in words but in flesh and blood, in lives.¹

Those days preceding the apostle's conversion crisis also help in an understanding of Paul's thought of and why he gave such importance to the cross and resurrection. After the resurrection, the first Christians had proclaimed Jesus to be the Messiah in spite of the cross, later because of the cross. To Saul the Pharisee, the cross refuted Jesus' claim to be the Messiah and also the gospel of the first days. The cross was the stumbling-block, the black cloud of Saul's unbelief. The first Christians were commentaries on the outer and inner facts of the cross and resurrection. The testimony of their

1. The first Christians did not coin such mystical phrases, nor did they associate the risen Christ with the activity of the Spirit. That was left for Paul to do. They may not have expressed such in words but they did in lives. That has been one of the important contentions of this chapter. The apostle was not converted to the Christianity which they had taught, but which they had lived. This became the basis of his Christian mysticism.

lives removed the barriers blocking the apostle's way, and converted him to Christianity.

From then on, the cross and resurrection became central. The cross formed the corner-stone of Paul's religion. The apostle's great battle waged against the gospel of the cross and his final conquest by the latter drove him to probe more deeply into its mystery and meaning. The first Christians had linked the cross with the redemptive purposes of God. Paul now went further. The cross was the full and final revelation of God's love and grace, His will to redeem men. The apostle interpreted past and future history in the light of the cross. The religion of Israel and the prophets had foretold it,¹ the life of Jesus was a prologue to it,² and the present activity of the risen Christ and His early return and judgment would crown and complete it.³

The first Christians had linked the forgiveness of sins with the cross.⁴ Paul saw in the cross Christ's great racial act by which man's sins had been forgiven.⁵ As a Pharisee, the apostle had trusted explicitly in works of the law as the way to win righteousness and Divine approval.⁶ After his conversion, his reaction from Judaism led him to see that through the cross of Christ man stood before God approved. Faith in God's atoning act in Christ alone granted this to man.⁷ Christ was the ground of the apostle's life. "In Christ" alone, he dared to stand before God.

Paul went even deeper into the mystery of the cross than this. The first Christians had declared that God's gift of salvation had come to man through Jesus' death upon the cross.⁸ The apostle's bitter experience with the law had revealed to him that salvation could never be earned by man. His

1. Eph. 3:1-8.

2. Phil. 2:5-11.

3. 2 Cor. 5:10.

4. Act. 3:18-19.

5. 1 Cor. 15:22.

6. Rom. 8:4

7. Rom. 3:22.

8. Act. 4:12.

conversion crisis had transformed the cross from a tremendous stumbling-block into that in which all his life and thought was centred. He never ceased to think about it, especially in relation to God. Salvation was God's gift. Paul's conversion crisis also led him to concern himself not only with the gift but the Giver and the Divine will of the Giver which had given redemption to man. It was a loving and gracious will, which had done such. Thus in the light of the cross, Paul must think of God in terms of grace and love. Now, these were the only adequate words to describe God.

The first Christians had proclaimed that the long-expected Messianic age in which the Spirit of God would be poured forth, was now present. Their lives testified to this. They linked the coming of the Spirit with Pentacost.¹ Damascus had made the cross and resurrection central in the apostle's thought. He must date earlier the coming of the Spirit. He related the outpouring of the Spirit to the cross and resurrection,² and associated it with God's grace and love, interpreting the former in terms of the latter. To the Hebrew, God was dynamic, not static. He acted in history. Because of his conversion crisis, Paul now came to believe that in Christ God had performed the greatest of all His acts in time. In the cross and resurrection He had revealed His gracious and loving will to redeem men. His Spirit had gone forth. The activity of the risen Christ continued this. The Parousia marked its consummation. In Christ, God had acted and continued to act. Abiding "in Christ", the apostle lived within that spiritual sphere in which God's redeeming grace, love and Spirit operated. Thus the apostle's experience with the law, those days preceding his conversion, the Christianity of the first Christians, and

1. Acts 2:1-4.

2. Rom. 1:4.

his conversion crisis contribute greatly to an understanding of the birth of Paul's faith and Christ mysticism, and why its character was of such a nature.

2. History Mysticism.

1

In the preceding chapter, the apostle's mysticism was called a History Mysticism, for two reasons. It had as its foundations the historic life, crucifixion, and death of Christ, as well as His resurrection and redeeming activity. It owed its origin to God's great intervention in history, in Christ for man's salvation. This had reached its climax in the cross and resurrection. God had stepped in on the stage of time, and the parousia would mark the culmination of this. The first Christians, their evangel, and more, their lives testified to this breaking in of God in the affairs of men, to work out His gracious will and loving purpose to redeem men. The first Christians also were the link between Paul and the historic Jesus. Their gospel proclaimed the outer facts, and what was of more importance, their lives revealed the inner facts. For this reason (and because of his reaction from the legalism of Judaism) Paul's Christianity was not a new legalism based on the life and teachings of Jesus. It was life "in Christ" as he had seen it in them. This explains also why Paul who never knew Jesus during his lifetime, nevertheless understood Him best.

3. Cross and Resurrection and Sacramental Mysticism.

The apostle's pre-Christian days and his conversion crisis also throw much light upon his cross and resurrection and sacramental mysticism. Already, it has been pointed out that these days explain the emphasis upon the cross and resurrection, which one finds in the thought of Paul, the conception of the

death and resurrection of Christ as a racial act on man's behalf, and the thought of God's grace, love and Spirit as having been dynamically at work in the cross and resurrection, and now active in the risen Christ. The apostle's cross and resurrection and sacramental mysticism contain all three. The cross and resurrection are central. By mystically sharing Christ's sufferings and dying and rising with Him by faith, the racial act of Calvary is re-enacted in the life of the believer, and the redeeming grace, love and Spirit of God, revealed in the cross and resurrection, become active in the heart of the believer. Paul is the first to stress the memorial aspect of the Lord's Supper. This was due also to his conversion crisis. Thus these days explain these mystical conceptions also, their origin, and why they were of such a character.

4. Ethical Mysticism and Ethic.

These days also shaped and determined the character of the apostle's ethical mysticism. Paul's faith or mystical fellowship with the risen Christ transformed him into the moral likeness of the latter. This risen Lord was the Jesus who had lived and had been crucified. The first Christians had reproduced in their own lives the moral likeness which Jesus had revealed in the days of His flesh, especially His love and self-sacrifice. In mystical fellowship with Christ, this moral likeness was shared by the apostle.

Paul's conversion crisis had made the cross central. It became all-important in his ethical mysticism. The cross was the greatest moral and redemptive power in his life. The cross and resurrection were to be morally enacted each day. He must die to sin and self, and rise to a new Christlike

life. The cross was also the origin, dynamic, and pattern of the apostle's ethic. His ethic was transcendental.

D. Roots of Paul's Mysticism.

1. Faith Mysticism.

Having examined the soil out of which the apostle's mysticism sprang, and having noted how this determined the character of that mysticism, let us now go deeper to the sub-soil in which his mysticism was rooted. Christianity is indebted to Paul more than to any other for the prominence in its vocabulary of the word, faith. It was central in his mystical thought. Though this be true, the history of the word is older than the apostle. It goes back to the early Church, to Jesus,¹ Judaism, and the Old Testament. It must be admitted that these predecessors did not give to faith so rich a meaning as the apostle, yet it was from them that he borrowed this word.² Trust in God was the root of Hebrew and Jewish piety. This is not true of Judaism. It made the law and trust in the law central. Faith or trust in God was only a minor note of Judaism.³ In the Old Testament, faith or trust meant unwavering confidence in or whole-hearted reliance upon God, who was regarded as personal. This resulted in a spiritual fellowship with God. At first only the nation shared in this. By the time of Jeremiah, this fellowship had become a personal matter;⁴ each individual might enjoy this.

2. Christ Mysticism.

-
1. The conception of faith held by the early Church and Jesus will be discussed in the next sub-section.
 2. Hatch - op. cit. p.73, points out that faith as Paul knew it is entirely lacking in the Greek and Oriental mystery cults. For a full discussion of faith refer to Hatch and Burton - Galatians, p.475-485.
 3. See--- p. 9, also Hatch - op. cit. p.12-21.
 4. See Chapter V, Prophetic Mysticism; kinship of Paul's faith mysticism with the former.

Although the apostle's Christ mysticism is his distinctive creation, it also was influenced by the past. The religion of the early Church and of Jesus determined to a great extent the character of the former. The apostle was converted by and to the Christianity of the first believers. It is difficult to arrive at a true estimate of this, since our only source is the book of Acts. This much can be said, although the thought of the parousia was very prominent, the risen Christ was central. He was an object of faith and worship.¹ Further, there are many suggestions in the book of Acts of a religion which had close kinship with that of the apostle.

The religion of the first disciples portrayed in the Synoptic Gospels offers a still greater problem. In the past, scholarship denied the possibility of Jesus being an object of faith and worship during the days of His flesh. Today, with the rise of the new "Formgeschichte Schule" and the focussing of interest once again upon these earliest days, the whole question has been reopened. What was once regarded as improbable is now looked upon as a possibility, and for many a fact.

"If we search for a term that will express this unique relation between the disciples and the Master...we should rather use the word 'numinous' as Rudolf Otto does...because here an apprehension of the Divine is dominant, which releases awe and self-surrender as in an act of worship...The movement that Jesus initiated had a personal significance and discipleship had a personal emphasis. Even in Jesus' lifetime the disciples were personal believers."²

1. Burton - Galatians, p.480-485, "πιστεύω εἰς" Act. 10:43, 14:23, 19:4. Hatch - op.cit. p.28. is of the opinion that this faith centred in Jesus as Lord and Messiah was primarily intellectual in character. This implied certain ethical consequences bringing the believer into submission to the rule of Christ. It also formed the basis of the disciples' religious and social life. Both scholars rule out the possibility of Jesus being an object of faith and worship during His lifetime. Matt.18:6, Mk.9:42 are not original. For Hatch, faith in the Synoptics implied trust in God and confidence in Jesus, especially in relation to such as healing. Faith also suggested loyalty and personal affection for Him, but nothing more.

2. Easton - The Gospel before the Gospels, p.77. He is quoting Dibelius.

Such conclusions ally the Christ mysticism of the apostle with the faith of these very first days. This is the sub-soil in which his mysticism is rooted.

There are also certain words spoken by or attributed to Jesus, personal, intimate, and mystical in character, which may have influenced the Christ mysticism of the apostle — "He who receives you receives me;" "For where two or three are gathered in my name I am there among them;" "in so far as you did it to one of these brothers of mine, even to the least of them, you did it to me;" "And I will be with you all the time to the very end of the world."

3. Cross and Resurrection Mysticism.

The apostle's conversion crisis and the Christianity of the first believers determined to a great extent the character of his cross and resurrection mysticism. It is also true that Jesus' teachings about the cross and His crucifixion were major factors influencing Paul's conception. On the way up to Jerusalem, Jesus had declared that He must suffer and die; He had taught His disciples about the cross, and had challenged them to follow in His footsteps. His crucifixion followed. All stamped itself upon the memory of the first followers. Later, with the apostle it had been likewise. The Hebrew conception of solidarity formed the basis of Paul's theological conception of the death of Christ as a racial act.

4. Sacramental Mysticism.

The sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper go back beyond Paul to the early Church and Jesus, and have their beginnings in Judaism and the religion of Israel. The apostle had described the rite of baptism from the

Mfft.

1. Matt. 10:40, Mfft. 2. Matt. 18:20, Mfft. 3. Matt. 25:40, / 4. Matt. 28:20, Mfft.
5. Mk. 8:31, 34-38; 9:31, 35 and parallels,
6. Refer to latter half of this chapter regarding the relation of Paul's sacramentalism to the Hellenic world.

more personal, inward, and psychological standpoint. The early Church regarded it from the more external and social point of view. The latter also allied it closely with their apocalyptic expectations. At baptism, the convert confessed his sins and renounced his old life and past allegiances.¹ He accepted Jesus as Messiah and Lord, and pledged his loyalty and life to Him. Baptism in the name of Jesus implied this.² At baptism the convert became a member of the new Messianic community, and shared in its eschatological salvation. This had been inaugurated by Jesus' death, and would be fully experienced on His return.³ The gift of the Spirit was associated with the rite of baptism.⁴ Baptism marked the beginning of their citizenship in the new age of the Spirit.

For the first Christians as well as for Paul, baptism was a sign and seal that all this had taken place, and it was more.⁵ It was a sacrament. Sacramentalism appears for the first time within Christianity here in the early Church. The baptismal experience not only symbolized that a great spiritual change had taken place. It aided in the furthering of this. It was an eventful occasion and a time of great expectancy. The rite made more positive and lasting the convert's renouncement of his past and his acceptance of Christ. It increased the believer's faith, and mediated a new and wondrous experience of God. Through the rite, there was a new inbreaking of God's Spirit. These days were so momentous and the lives of the first Christians so linked with the Divine, that it was inevitable that their rites should be transformed into sacraments, channels of Divine grace. The religion of these first Christians

1. Act. 22:16; 2:38. 2. Act. 10:48; 8:16. 3. Act. 3:20-21.

4. Sometimes the coming of the Spirit was simultaneous with the performance of the rite, Act. 2:38; sometimes it preceded, Act. 9:18; 10:47-48 and again it was given after, Act. 8:16.

5. It must be admitted that positive evidence regarding sacramentalism is lacking, but when one remembers the limitations of Acts as data, the claim of sacramentalism is more than probable.

was not a sacramentalism of a magical kind, for this could take place without¹ the aid of the sacraments.

Little is known as to what Jesus thought of baptism. We are told that He was baptized by John the Baptist.² The Fourth gospel notes that the disciples of Jesus baptized, but their Master did not.³ Baptism is closely associated with His predecessor, John the Baptist. The baptism of John was a lustral both, whereby the converts were received and sealed for the expected Kingdom. The rite was even more eschatological than that of the early Church. It symbolized repentance, and preparation for the expected Kingdom, and the remission of sins which would follow. It was an outward seal of an inward reformation.⁴

Baptism was to be found in Judaism and the religion of Israel, but it was not regarded as a sacrament, as^a medium of Divine grace. This rite pointed back to the Levitical washings of earlier times. Their original purpose was to remove ceremonial defilement. It was only natural that they should come to be regarded as a symbol of repentance, removal of sin and moral conversion.⁵ From these, Judaism developed its baptismal rite, and since it was a great proselytising religion, it demanded that its Gentile converts should undergo such⁶ before they were fit to share the blessings of Judaism.

1. Act. 11:17; 15:9. 2. Mk. 1:9. 3. Jn. 4:2. This is likely an anti-sacramental touch.

4. Lietzmann - Baptism, Ency. Britt. p.82, regards the baptism of John as more than a Levitical purificatory washing. It signified a spiritual turning away from sin and an entry into a new and purer life. Oesterley and Box - Religion and Worship of the Synagogue, go further. They claim that the germ of sacramentalism was to be found in the Jewish belief that washing cleansed from sin p. 260, and that the Baptist's formula, repent and be baptised, implies that this germ had developed and that John regarded the rite as a sacrament, p.264. Baptism as practised by the Essenes was also sacramental, p.263. The whole question is a difficult one and any conclusion will have in it the element of uncertainty.

5. Is. 1:16; Jer. 4:14; Eccl. 13:1. 6. Abrahams - Studies in Pharisaism - Vol.1 p.37, regards this as probable, at least by the time of the Baptist. Schurer - History of the Jewish People, Vol. 2, p.322 and Edersheim - Life and Times, Vol. 2, p. 747 accept this as a certainty.

The question of the rise of the baptismal rite is strewn with difficulties, beginning with its early origins, its character in Judaism, the baptism of John (whether it was sacramental or not,) the sacramentalism of the early Church, its later mystical development in Paul, and concluding with the full-blown magical sacramentalism of the second century. Though the question is beset with problems, there is evidence enough to show that the apostle was indebted to Judaism, the Baptist, and especially to the early Church, for his conception of baptism. He borrowed the sacramental baptism of the early Church, and this developed into the characteristic Pauline conception, in consequence of his conversion crisis and his mystical religion centred in the cross.

The question of the Lord's Supper is even more controversial than that of the rite of baptism. One of the most perplexing problems confronting historical research is to discover what happened in the Upper Room and to trace the links connecting with the early Church, the mystical sacramentalism of Paul, and finally the magical sacramental realism of the Church Fathers. In the past, ¹ certain scholars were too prone to give up all hope of finding the origins of the Supper within Palestine, and they turned to the Greek world for an explanation. Today, on the contrary, the Palestinian Church and Jesus' own lifetime have become a fruitful field of investigation.

In summing up the present-day conclusions on this whole question, one might make four divisions. Certain scholars regard the Supper in the Upper Room as having been the Jewish Kiddush meal, others, the Passover repast. A third group accepting the Synoptic records as broadly historical looks upon the meal as wholly apocalyptic, while a fourth holds it to be a Kiddush meal with Pascal ² significance.

1. The question of Paul's indebtedness to the Mystery Religion meals will be discussed in the latter part of this chapter.
2. See Appendix C for a complete statement of these views.

The last view mentioned is the most convincing, and harmonizes the different divergent traditions. Whether the Lord's Supper was the last of the Kiddush meals which Jesus was accustomed to eat with His disciples or a Pascal meal, and whether the Markan or Lukan traditions are the more authentic, the meal would undoubtedly have been linked with the Passover. The minds of all present would turn back to God's redemption of Israel from Egypt's bondage,¹ to the old Sinai covenant,² and to Jeremiah's covenant.³ Jesus did not regard His death as a tragedy. The shedding of blood had instituted the old covenant, and Jesus would regard His death as likewise, ushering in that new covenant and redemption⁴ foretold by prophecy.⁵ His life had been linked with the Kingdom and the will of God to redeem.⁶ His death was the crowning act. The Supper spoke of that redemption which His sacrifice would bring to pass. It was also a pledge of the continuance of the disciples' fellowship and of their coming reunion in the Kingdom.⁷

The early Church perpetuated this Supper. In doing so, the Kiddush meals of former days were also continued. The first believers broke bread⁸ and gave thanks, looking forward to Christ's early return. Fellowship was the dominant note; the meal was an Agape. Having said this, one does not deny that Christ's sacrifice was remembered. The rite of baptism looked backward as well as forward.⁹ The death of Christ had forgiven their sins. The same thoughts would be uppermost at this feast. And it is more than probable also¹⁰ that the Agape as well as the rite of baptism was a sacrament.

In the apostle's day, certain abuses found their way into the Lord's

1. Deut. 7:8. 2. Exod. 24. 3. Jer. 31:31-34. 4. Mk. 14:24.
 5. Ezek. 36:22-30. 6. Matt. 18:11. 7. Mk. 14:25. 8. Act. 2:42, 46; 20:7.
 9. Act. 2:48. 10. Lk. 24:13-31, suggests a sacramental experience.

1

Supper as partaken by the Corinthian Church. For this reason, the apostle separated the common meal or Agape from the rite, and the Eucharist, as it was later known, began to take form. Since the cross was central in all Paul's thinking, and because his religion was a faith mysticism, a faith fellowship with the risen Christ, the notes of commemoration (memorial) and communion with Christ were now emphasized as well as fellowship one with another. Thus the Eucharist, the mystical sacramental meal as the apostle knew it, had close affiliations with that of the early Church, and it had its origin in the Last Supper in the Upper Room.

5. Mystical Conception of the Church.

3

Paul's mystical conception of the Church points back beyond the koinonia of the first Christians and the disciple band in Jesus' lifetime, to Judaism and the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, the assembly of Israel was sometimes called ⁴"הָעֵדֻת", sometimes ⁵"בְּדָרֶךְ". The former word corresponded to the Greek "συναγωγή", the latter, to "ἐκκλησία." In usage these two Greek words are nearly synonymous. The LXX translates ⁴"בְּדָרֶךְ" by ⁵"ἐκκλησία", ⁴"הָעֵדֻת" by ⁵"συναγωγή", from Deuteronomy on. The words implied that the Jews were a covenant people, redeemed at the Exodus, the Israel of God. With the dispersion of the Jews throughout the Greek world, the word ⁵"ἐκκλησία", formerly used by preference, for the Jewish assembly or community, was replaced by ⁴"συναγωγή". The Greek-speaking world named their civil assembly ⁵"ἐκκλησία", and therefore the Jews chose the other term. It was natural that, with the rise of the early Church, the first Christians, especially Greek-speaking,

1. 1 Cor. 11:33-34.

2. These notes were to be found within the early Church. Paul was the first to stress them.

3. Refer for a full treatment of the word ⁵"ἐκκλησία" to Burton-Galatians, pp. 415-420.

4. Numb. 27:17; Josh. 22:17. 5. Exod. 16:3; Neh. 7:66,

would prefer "ἐκκλησία" with reference to their local congregations, and simultaneously with their missionary endeavours, the more universal meaning suggested by the Old Testament "בְּרִי" and LXX "ἐκκλησία" would develop. With the apostle this became prominent. The Church of Christ was the new redeemed Israel of God, one and continuous with the Israel of God in the Old Testament, a Divine institution established, sustained, called, and set apart by God.¹

In this soil also, Paul's mystical conception of the unity and solidarity of the Church was rooted. The Church of the first Christian days was knit together like a brotherhood or family.² "There was but one heart and soul among the multitude of believers."³ Rabbinical writings suggest even closer affinities with the apostle's thought. Israel as a whole was one self-contained organism, and all the component parts were dependent upon one another in spiritual things. Where righteousness was lacking in one, this was supplied by others who were more righteous.⁴ In the Old Testament, the same conception is present, though not so fully developed.⁵ In Isaiah, Israel is compared to a man whose whole body, head, heart, feet, all, is sick with sin. Paul was especially indebted to the Old Testament for his conception of solidarity, so central in his theology and conception of the Church. His mystical metaphor of the Church as the bride of Christ goes back also to the Old Testament.⁶

6. Conception of the Spirit.

The apostle's conception of the Spirit and the origins of this⁷ constitute

another very difficult and controversial question in Pauline study. In

1. Eph. 1:12. 2. Act. 2:44. 3. Act. 4:32, Mfft.

4. Oesterley - The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation, p.77. 5. Is. 1:5-6.

6. Eph. 5:23-29; 2 Cor. 11:2; Is. 54:5-6; Jer. 3:1, Ezek. 16:23, 33; Hosea 2:19.

7. Denney - The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans, Exp. Vol. 4. "The conception of the Spirit is by far the most difficult thing to master in the theology of St. Paul." p.422.

touching upon this earlier in these pages, it was maintained that Paul¹ thought of the Spirit after the manner of the Old Testament. The early Church had done likewise. The resurrection of Jesus heralded the baptism of the Christian community with the Holy Spirit. At Pentecost it had been poured forth upon the first converts, and its activity was akin to that of the Hebrew Spirit of old. The promises of the prophets had been fulfilled, and the Messianic age was now present. This Spirit resembled a mighty power which took temporary possession of men, bestowing upon them extraordinary gifts — gifts of tongues,² miracles,³ guidance of the Spirit.⁴ It even included the Gentiles within its circle of activity.⁵ God had given the Spirit, and the risen Christ was also connected with its bestowal. His resurrection marked its advent. The first Christians associated the Spirit with the life of the Christian community, but more especially they regarded it as having been bestowed upon certain leaders — Peter, Stephen, Barnabas. They did not associate its activity with that of the risen Lord. The early Church thought of the Spirit sometimes as an impersonal force,⁶ or again as a personal power,⁷ which when bestowed would remain with the individual.⁸ This personal power began to be regarded also as moral.⁹ In these days, the thought of the Spirit was developing in the direction of the Pauline conception — a permanent possession and related to the moral life of a man.

The conception of the Spirit is mainly absent from the mission and teachings of Jesus. Some scholars rule out the few scriptural references to the Holy Spirit as ungenuine. Jesus as a man of the Spirit was

1. p. 68. 2. Act. 2:4. 3. Act. 8:6. 4. Act. 10:19.
5. Act. 10:45. 6. Act. 2:2-3. 7. Act. 5:3. 8. Act. 6:3.
9. Act. 5:3, 9.

a fact which the Synoptic writers preferred to leave in the background. Their conception of the Son of God would not fit in with their thought of the Spirit.

In the religious literature of Palestinian Judaism,¹ there are very few references to the Spirit of God. The prophetic voice was now silent; revelation had ceased. The law with its codification, interpretation, and adaptation to the minutiae of every day life, had replaced the age of prophecy and of the Spirit.² Yet the prophetic conception had not been completely quenched. There was a promise of a glorious future outpouring of the Spirit upon the expected Messiah.³ In this literature also, the conception of the Spirit became more moral as the thought of the holiness of God developed along moral lines.⁴

The Old Testament⁵ gives an important place to the conception of the Spirit. "רוח", the Hebrew word for spirit, in the earliest literature was probably originally a term for substance, and although the thought of the Spirit of God through development acquired a more qualitative and ethical sense, a trace of this more primitive

1. Refer to pp. 153-4 for the conception of the Spirit in Hellenistic Judaism.

2. Scott- The Spirit in the New Testament, p.47.

3. Enoch. 62;2; Ps. Sol. 17:42.

4. Jub. 1:21.

5. For a complete treatment of the Old Testament and Pauline conceptions of Spirit refer to Burton - Galatians, p.488-9.

meaning clung to it. The earliest writers looked upon the Spirit as a power which had its origin in the Divine, and which came upon man suddenly and spasmodically, endowing with physical power.¹ It also endowed the earlier prophets with the gift of prophecy. Its visitation had some abiding significance — Elijah, David. Owing to the prophetic movement, the conception of the Spirit lost most of its cruder and physical meaning, and came to be regarded as more moral and spiritual in character. It was a supernormal power, ethical in quality, going out from God and abiding permanently with men, the power of God operative in the ethical and religious life of the nation.² Although the work of the Spirit was mainly concerned with the nation, its activity was beginning to be associated also with the spiritual life of the individual.

The apostle's conception of the Spirit was the culmination of this prophetic movement. In the light of their new experience of the moral character of God, the prophets^{had} been forced to revise completely their views regarding the Spirit of God. Paul had to do likewise, face to face with the cross of Christ and the revelation of God in Christ as love. God's Spirit had been active in the cross and resurrection, going out to men; through the risen Christ it continued/

1. Jud. 13:25.

2. Is. 61:1.

continued to be mediated to men, dwelling in their lives and recreating morally. The apostle must think of this Spirit in terms of dynamic love.

E. Summary.

Thus far in our examination of the formative influences, it has been shown that the Christianity of the first days, Paul's conversion crisis, his experience with the religion of Judaism, Judaism itself, and the Old Testament are the most important factors which moulded and determined the character of the central conceptions of the apostle's mysticism. His Christ and faith, Historic, Cross and Resurrection, Sacramental mysticism, his mystical conception of the Church and the Spirit are rooted and take their rise in this soil.

II. JUDAISM.

A. Palestinian Judaism.

1. Mysticism in Judaism.

In the past scholars¹ were hesitant about associating mysticism with Judaism, but mysticism (a religion of passionate yearning for fellowship with God) is a phenomenon which is found in all religions. Today it is being

1. Even Dean Inge, an outstanding exponent of mysticism writes "The Jewish mind and character, in spite of its deeply religious bent was alien to mysticism." Christian Mysticism, p.39. On the contrary, other scholars find evidence of mysticism within Judaism. Abelson- The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature; -Jewish Mysticism; - Hebrew and Jewish Mysticism. E.R.E. Vol. 9. His treatment is mainly concerned with Mediaeval Jewish Mysticism although he does deal with what precedes. Kennedy - St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, pp. 33-57.

recognized that there were other, though lesser currents in Judaism, besides
 Apocalypticism and Rabbinism with its law.¹ Mysticism was one of these.² The
 apostle's personal and ethical faith mysticism had no kinship with this, but
 if one claims that Paul borrowed his from the world of his day, it is just as
 legitimate to turn in this direction for his/^{source,} as it is to go to the Greek
 world. The Rabbinic mystic enjoyed an ecstatic experience, while studying the
 law. Contemplating God's word, he was given a vision of the Divine, and beheld
 the world beyond.³ Closely associated with this, there were also esoteric
 knowledge, mystical allegorical exegesis of scripture, the conception of the
 Merkabah (the lore of the heavenly chariot of Ezekiel), the Schechinah (an
 emanation of God embodying the Divine Presence), the Metatron (the counterpart
 of Rabbinic mysticism to the personalized Logos of Philo), and other less
 important mystical conceptions.⁴

1. See p.8. In making this division between Rabbinic or Legalistic and Apocalyptic Judaism, we are not drawing a sharp line between the two, for in many cases they overlap.

2. Since it was held that Judaism was not mystical in the past, the Fourth Gospel Mysticism was explained in terms of Hellenism. Today, scholars are turning to Jewish Mysticism. "..... this mystical Judaism stands with Mandaism against Rabbinism....." Howard-The Fourth Gospel, p.172-173. Odeberg has especially carried on researches in this field comparing the Fourth Gospel Mysticism with that of Third Enoch (a work probably not later than the second century and partly earlier)-the Fourth Gospel. The whole question of this interpretation of the Fourth Gospel Mysticism is very controversial, but the trend in this direction proves that the religion of Judaism was of a very composite character and that mysticism was to be found here. The Odes of Solomon also exhibit a mysticism much like that of the Fourth Gospel. It is difficult to say whether this work is a Christian or Jewish production partially or wholly and whether it influenced the Fourth Gospel or was influenced by it. Ely-The Kingdom of God in the Fourth Gospel, p.113-114. Gaister finds mysticism in the religion of the Samaritans for at least two centuries before and following the destruction of Jerusalem -The Samaritans, p.84-87.

3. Kirk - Vision of God, p.82. Kennedy - op. cit. p.45.

4. Refer to Abelson and Kennedy. The mysticism of Third Enoch is of much the same character.

2. Apocalyptic Mysticism.

The Apocalyptist also had his mystic vision.¹ This was granted to him more often than to the Rabbi. It was also ecstatic, sudden, and of short duration, but with no loss of consciousness.

"And when I saw all, the two men went away from me and thence forward I saw them not. And they left me alone at the end of heaven and I grew afraid and fell on my face ... On the tenth Heaven, Aravoth, I saw the appearance of the Lord's face like iron made to glow in fire. Then I saw the Lord's face, but the Lord's face is ineffable,² marvellous and very awful and very very terrible."

This mysticism also differed greatly in character from that of the apostle.

3. Schweitzer.

Dr. Schweitzer³ finds the explanation of Paul's mysticism here in apocalypticism. He discovers in the letters of the apostle a logical, consistent eschatology. Paul's mysticism was historical cosmic. In the death and resurrection of Christ, the natural order ceased, and the supernatural order dawned.⁴ During the world period between the resurrection and the Parousia, these transient and eternal orders mingled. The powers of the supernatural order of the final age to come were at work. The original and kernel conception of the apostle is that of the Elect who share with one another and with Christ a quasi-physical corporeity susceptible to the now active powers of death and resurrection.⁵ Redemption is cosmologically conceived. Christ's return/

1. Here the dividing line between the Apocalyptist and Rabbis disappears.

2. 2nd Enoch 21:2-5; 22:2-8. See also 1 Enoch 39:1-8; 70:1-3; 2 Baruch 36:1-37:1; 4 Ezra 14:38-41: Apocalypse of Abraham 9:1-6; 10:1-4; Vision of Isaiah 6:10-15.

3. Schweitzer - Paul and His Interpreters; the Mysticism of Paul. The latter is one of the latest of the most important interpretations of Paul.

4. Schweitzer - The Mysticism of Paul, p.23.

5. op. cit. p.101.

return will complete it. The solidarity of the Elect, who are supernatural in a physical corporeal sense, grows.

Baptism, a realistic sacramental rite, is the gateway to this redemption.¹ At Jesus' death and resurrection, the powers of the supernatural order had become active. They continued in the solidarity of the Elect. Outwardly the natural existence of those comprising the Elect had not changed, yet they were supernatural beings like Christ. At baptism, by dying and rising with Christ, the believer is supernaturally transferred from the present to the coming aeon. He enters into the community of God, the corporeity of the Elect, coming into fellowship with Christ and the Elect. He is "in Christ." This experience is not individual or subjective.² Then the Spirit and love, the gift of the Spirit, are given. The Lord's Supper is also a realistic sacramental rite, effecting a union with the Elect, the mystical body of Christ, and anticipating the table fellowship with Christ at the Messianic feast. The Church is the corporeity of the Elect made visible.³

Dr. Schweitzer condemns the exponents of the Hellenistic interpretation of Paul for committing certain sins, yet he also does likewise.⁴ Both he and Reitzenstein explain the apostle wholly in terms of environment—the former, apocalypticism; the latter, Hellenism. Schweitzer forces the thought of Paul into a logical, consistent theory of eschatology.⁵ According to him, this eschatology was mystical, yet Jewish eschatology does not contain a mysticism akin to that of the apostle,⁶ especially that Pauline mysticism

1. op. cit. p.123.

2. op. cit. p.123.

3. op. cit. p.110.

4. op. cit. p.27. Schweitzer charges Reitzenstein with smothering the apostle with parallels from the Hellenic world. He does likewise only he borrows from the world of Apocalypticism.

5. Paul did not have such. See ,Eschatology p.56-60. His eschatology was essentially religious.

6. See immediate preceding pages.

outlined by Schweitzer. There are two insuperable objections to his interpretation, the emphasis he places upon baptism and the place he gives to faith. According to him, baptism is central, a realistic sacramental rite, magical, non-ethical, and having no relation to faith.¹ Dying and rising are the key words of Paul's mysticism; thus the believer is brought into a quasi-physical, corporeal oneness with Christ and the Elect. An examination of the apostle's letters does not reveal this conception of sacramentalism or this emphasis upon baptism or the mystical phrase, dying and rising. Schweitzer's greatest stumbling-block is the Pauline word, faith. He divides up the apostle's thought under three heads, eschatological, judicial, and mystical, and thus he attempts to explain faith away,² but this is impossible. For him, faith is not central in the apostle's mysticism, neither is the latter personal nor ethical. Underlying all Schweitzer's work, there is a fallacy which leads him astray. He assumes that both Jesus and Paul must be understood wholly in terms of apocalypticism.

Disagreement with Dr. Schweitzer does not make invalid for us all his conclusions. His reaction from and criticism of the position of the comparative religion school are very welcome. For him, Paul was primarily a Jew. Further he has pointed out that no gulf existed between Jesus and Paul. The apostle interpreted the mind of Jesus. We may not agree with Schweitzer's detailed arguments to substantiate this claim, but we are in hearty accord with his judgment. In connection with these conclusions, modern scholarship has become a great debtor to Dr. Schweitzer.

1. op. cit. p.117.

2. op. cit. p.25; 206.

B. Hellenistic Judaism.

1. Hellenistic Judaism.

As well as the Judaism of Palestine,¹ there was also that of the Diaspora, centred especially in Alexandria. This Hellenistic Judaism was less intolerant than the former. It enjoyed the favour of the Ptolemies and developed side by side with the broadening spirit of Hellenism, borrowing from the latter. It therefore blended into one, many elements of the thought and culture of both the Jewish and Greek civilizations. The apostle was a Diaspora Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in which this syncretism of the Oriental and Occidental spirit was much in evidence.² Brought up in this environment, Paul was fitted to dress and adorn Christianity in order that it would be acceptable to the Greek world. By way of these channels, the apostle came ^{into} contact with this Greek civilization, and those minor traces of Hellenistic culture which appear in his epistles found their way into his letters.

2. Wisdom.

The book of Wisdom³ is one of the finest literary products of this Jewish Alexandrian religion.⁴ The theme of the writer is Wisdom, a conception which is the result of a union of the Hebrew Wisdom of Proverbs and the Logos Spirit of the Stoics. It is the immanent Divine Reason which permeates all things, even substance, yet it retains the practical and moral emphasis of Hebrew associations. The result is a Greek synthesis of Divine essence, cosmic principle and moral law.⁵ It is difficult to say how far this Greek immanental

1. See p.7-12.

2. Ramsay - Cities of St. Paul, p.89.

3. Written about 50 B.C. Oesterley-The Book of Wisdom, p.XV-XIX. Some scholars regard it of composite origin, others, the work of a single writer.

4. Fairweather - The Background of the Gospels, p.337.

5. Rees - op. cit. p.46.

conception dominated the thought of Spirit in the book of Wisdom. Dr. Robinson is of the opinion that this has been exaggerated. "The Hebrew connotation of ruach remains fundamental in regard to transcendent personal activity and ethical content."¹ The Spirit was regarded as personal but not a person. For the first^{time}/we may speak of the hypostasis of the Holy Spirit. It was thought of as a Divine attribute endowed with separate existence. The Pauline conception has much in common. Because of this, many scholars claim that Paul was influenced greatly by the former. The apostle may have been indebted, but he did not share in its more immanent, materialistic emphasis. Scholars also find a close literary relationship between the epistles of Paul and the book of Wisdom.²

3. Philo.

³ Philo is the cope-stone of the structure reared by this Jewish Alexandrian movement. He was the greatest of all the Jewish philosophers of the Alexandrian school. Philo's closest affinities are with Plato, the later Pythagoreans, and the Stoics, yet at heart he was a Jew seeking to recommend Judaism to the respect and possibly the acceptance of the Greek world. He interpreted the Septuagint in a Greek mystical way. The Torah was the supreme revelation of the Divine wisdom and authority. Philo's attempt to blend Jewish and Greek conceptions produced many contradictions in his works.

His thought of God is mainly Greek. He is an absolute, an abstraction without qualities, unknown and unknowable. God's transcendent will did not permit Him to come into direct contact with created things. The Logos

1. Robinson - The Holy Spirit, Enc. Britt. 14th ed. Vol. II, p. 685.

2. Knox - op. cit. p. 126-130; Thackeray maintains that Paul made a study of this book. The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, p. 231.

3. He lived about the beginning of the Christian era.

enables God to act in an immanent fashion; it was the mediator between God and man. Thus there is a semi-dualism between God and the world, the spiritual and the material. This dualism is also to be found in man. The soul of man is in the prison-house of the body;¹ it is in bondage to the flesh. Though God was distant from man, the latter was not far removed from God. Man had a soul, which was his rational capacity, the impress of the Divine Reason, that element which linked the human with the Divine. This is the secret whereby man can release himself from the body and this world, and ascend to God. Release is desirable since the bodily affections not only cloud the intelligence, but also interfere with the right practice of virtue.² Faith was demanded. A man must distrust and detach himself from the natural, and hazard everything upon the Invisible.

Philo's mysticism was extremely intellectual in character. All man's mental processes must be concentrated upon the Divine. By contemplation of God and the Divine within man, the spiritual is liberated from the bodily and material entanglements, and rises to its Goal. This process is attributed to the grace of God. In the last stages of this flight, intellectual contemplation is replaced by an ecstasy, an inward rapture, in which all precise knowledge disappears. This is an exultant experience of Divine possession in which self-consciousness is completely lost. Philo divides this ecstasy into four types:³ 1. mad frenzy producing derangement in old age, 2. intense stupor, 3. quiescence of the understanding when at any time it comes to be still, 4. divine possession and frenzy characteristic of prophetic natures. He describes the last and most prized state thus.

1. Leg. All. III 40-43. Philo - Colson and Whitaker.

2. De Migr. Abr. 44; Kennedy "Philo is the first great psychologist of faith." Philo's Contribution to Religion, p.121. Refer to Kennedy for a full treatment of Philo.

3. Quis Rev. Div. H. 249-250.

"Therefore my soul, if thou feelest any yearning to inherit the good things of God, leave not only the land, that is the body, thy kinsfolk, that is the senses, thy father's house (Gen.XII,I) that is speech, but be a fugitive from thyself also and issue forth from thyself. Like persons possessed and corybants, be filled with inspired franzy, even as the prophets are inspired. For it is the mind which is under the divine afflatus and no longer in its own keeping, but is stirred to its depths and maddened by heavenward yearnings drawn by₁ the truly existent and pulled upward there to... "

Philo's and Paul's thought of God and His relation to the world and man explains the marked difference between their mysticisms. In this respect,
the apostle was a Hebrew, Philo a Greek.² For Paul, God was a personality who enjoyed fellowship with man. His character was such that He acted in time; He broke in upon the world's history, and revealed His holy will and redeeming purpose. Man's relationship to the Divine was one of faith. This was a fellowship, personal, moral, and continuous. Philo accepted the Greek view and dualism of Alexandria. God was an abstraction, not capable of direct contact with the world and man. He did not descend to man; man must ascend to Him. This necessitated a flight from the world. Such is not found in Paul's letters. Reason was the door to Philo's spiritual world and the way of escape from the body and the material. An intellectual contemplation culminating in an ecstatic vision lifted man to the Divine. Philo calls this last stage faith.³ Faith was the end, not as with Paul, the beginning and ground of the religious life. It was a type of ecstasy. This vision or fellowship with the Divine was individualistic and of short duration. These marked characteristics reveal the radical differences between the mysticisms of Paul and Philo. The apostle was in no way indebted to the latter for the central conceptions/

1. Quis Rev. Div. H. 69-70. For a description of the experience of union see Leg. All. III 43-46.

2. In Chapter V the Hebrew and Greek views will be discussed fully.

3. Hatch - op. cit. p. 80.

conceptions of his mysticism.

III. Hellenism.

1. The Rise and Spread and the Character of the Mysteries and Kindred Religions.

For the first few centuries after the birth of Christianity, her greatest rivals were the mystery religions. From the second century B.C. to the fourth century A.D., these were a dominant religious factor in the Greek-speaking world. Sweeping in from the Orient, they replaced the old state religions of Greece and Rome. The latter had as their deities the gods of the merged Olympian Capitoline system, the joint contribution of the two peoples. These religions were associated with the social and political life of the people. In time they became outgrown and fell into disrepute, for they failed especially to minister to the personal and moral yearnings of the individual. An attempted revival under Augustus failed to reinstate them.

On the contrary their successors, the mystery religions, were of a personal and voluntary character. These conquered and supplanted the state religions, because they met with far greater satisfaction the needs of the senses, emotions, intellect, and conscience of men.¹ They stressed especially life after death and the future of bliss promised to the initiated. The most important of these Oriental religions were the mysteries of Dionysus, Orphism, Cybele - Attis, Isis-Osiris (or Serapis), Persian Mithras, and ^{the cult at} Greek/Eleusis. Most of these mysteries were independent religious associations or brotherhoods, having no connection with the state or the established worship of the community. The most famous and important exception was the state mysteries at Eleusis.

1. Cumont - Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, p.28.

These religions were a development from the more primitive vegetation cults with their nature cycles and legends of the death and rebirth of mythological gods and goddesses of antiquity. The mysteries were personal and private, deeply interested in the future life and salvation from this world. They demanded a certain measure of personal purity. This marked them superior to their contemporaries. Finally, they offered by means of initiations, rites and sacraments, union with their deities, release from this world and immortality. In the Hermetic and astral religions, akin to the mysteries and yet superior, salvation came by knowledge, "gnosis." There were no sacraments. All these religions shared alike certain common presuppositions. The world of the senses, the material world, was transient and inferior to the transcendent world. The soul of man was a spark of or belonged to the divine. This had become mixed up with and bound to the material world. By rites and sacraments or by gnosis, this divine element received salvation and was freed from and lifted out of its lower state into a higher one.

2. Their Mysticism.

1

The mystery religions were not all of equal character. Some were more primitive than others. The cult of Dionysus was the lowest in the scale. Its mysticism was orgiastic. It goes back to the ecstasy and violence of ancient savagery. Dionysus was a Thracian god who later became the Greek wine deity. The legend of the cult tells of the birth of Dionysus out of his dying earth-mother Semele, his father Zeus, the sky and rain god having smitten

1. The bibliography on this subject is tremendous; refer especially to Rohde-Psyche; Cumont - Oriental Religions; Dill - Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius; Angus - Christianity and the Mystery Religions; the Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World; Willoughby-Pagan Regeneration; Wilson, Paul and Paganism. These religions were syncretistic. They merged with and borrowed from each other; consequently each cult had not only one, but several and oft-times contradictory legends connected with their deity. Their rites and customs also varied according as they developed.

her with a thunderbolt. Dionysus was therefore the god of vegetation and the wine deity. His votaries sacrificed a bull, and partook of a meal of raw flesh and blood. This was followed by an orgy of dancing, in which the participants, called the Bacchae, became inspired and possessed with divine madness. They became "ἐν θεῷ", in the god or full of the god. Immortality was their reward.

The mysticism of the cult of Attis was also orgiastic in character. The cult flourished in Asia Minor, and was connected with Cybele, the Great Mother of the Gods. This mystery was the first to invade the West, being introduced into Rome in 204 B.C., in the hope of victory over Carthage. According to the myth of the cult, the goddess mother loved the hero divinity, Attis, who personified the vegetable world. Attis was slain either by another or his own hand. The grief and mourning of the goddess for her dead lover finally effected his rebirth and thus he became deified and immortal. From March ^{to the} 15th/27th, the votaries of Attis held their festivals. On March 24th, "the day of blood", the death of Attis was re-enacted, the worshippers indulging in a frenzy of grief symbolizing that of Cybele. They also emasculated themselves. On the following day, Attis was believed to be aroused from death. Later, the mystic rites of the taurobolium¹ were connected with this cult. This was a bath in the blood of a sacrificed bull. Late inscriptions refer to the rites of Attis thus. "I have eaten from the drum, I have drunk from the symbol, I have become an initiate of Attis."² The votary who fulfilled the requirements

1. There was an earlier and a later rite. The earlier appeared after the middle of the first century. Cumont - op. cit. 66. Dill - op. cit. p.557. This was not a form of initiation but a sacrifice; the later was one of initiation. Hepding - (Schweitzer - Paul and His Interpreters, p.183-184). Several inscriptions have been found connecting this later "bath of blood" with regeneration, but they are not earlier than the fourth century and may have been influenced by Christian thought. Cave - op. cit. p.275.

2. Cumont - op. cit. p.68.

of the cult's initiation became the god himself; he became Attis.¹

Other cults were of a less primitive form, and had a mysticism of identification, in which the initiates became the god; they were deified. Orphism was one of these. This mystery was the cult of Dionysus, reformed and purified. It was more sober and controlled, having within it certain cosmological and philosophical tendencies. Orphism was an attempt to justify the earlier Dionysian mythology. A new legend developed. Zagreus, son of Zeus and Persephone, was torn to pieces by the Titans, the enemies of Zeus, and was devoured. The heart of Zagreus was rescued and brought to Zeus, who swallowed it. From Zeus there sprang the new Dionysus, son of Zeus and Semele, in whom Zagreus came to life again. Zeus blasted the Titans, and from their ashes man was created. This Orphic myth was concerned with the origin, dualism, and final destiny of man. Man bore the guilt of the Titans' crime, but there was a way of deliverance in the Orphic rite. Salvation came to the initiate who ate of the raw flesh of the sacred meal. Thus he enacted the ancient story of the death and rebirth of Dionysus Zagreus, and became identified with the god; he was deified and made immortal.

"I am the child of Earth and of Starry Heaven;
But my race is of Heaven alone."²

The Egyptian mystery of Isis, Osiris (Serapis) was similar in character.³ In the first century A.D. it was a prohibited religion in the Roman Empire. The third century marked the height of its power.⁴ Later, it was overshadowed by Mithraism. According to the ancient myth, The cult myth does not vary much from its contemporaries. / Osiris meets death

1. Angus - op. cit. p.110.

2. Harrison - Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religions, p.661, appendix on the Orphic tablets.

3. Cumont - op. cit. p.83-88.

4. " op. cit. p. 83.

at the hands of his brother, Typhon. The mourning of his wife Isis, the feminine principle of nature, and the magical rites she performed over his body brought him back to life. Later, as a ^{result of} the efforts of the Ptolemies, who sought to combine the Greek and Egyptian religions within Egypt, Osiris was replaced by the Hellenistic deity, Serapis, who became Lord of the underworld. Some conception of the character of this cult is given us by Apuleius, in his account of the initiation of Lucius. Lucius had to undergo a bath of cleansing and purification.¹ Ten days later, he was initiated and granted a vision of the gods. Because of this, he had become identified with the gods and was now a deity.

"...thus I was adorned like unto the sun, and made in fashion of an image, when the curtains were drawn aside and all the people compassed about to behold me."²

Certain other inscriptions suggest that there was also a meal connected with the cult.³ The rites also guaranteed immortality to the votary.

"As truly as Osiris lives the initiate shall live;
as truly as Osiris is not dead shall he not die;
as truly as Osiris is not annihilated shall he not be annihilated."⁴

The cult of Eleusis was the only state mystery religion enjoying the official patronage of Athens. It was a synthesis of more primitive Greek and Oriental vegetation religions. According to the cult legend, the daughter of Demeter, the "giver of goodly crops", was stolen by Pluto and carried off to the underworld to be his bride. The grief of the mother restored her daughter. This cult obtained great influence. The mysteries, the lesser and greater,

1. Apuleius - Metamorphosis (The Golden Ass) XI. 23. 2. XI 24.
3. Pap. Oxyr i, 110 "Chairemon invites you to dinner at the table of the Lord Serapis in the Serapaeum, to morrow, i.e. the 15th." Kennedy - St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p.259.
4. C I L III 1090, Easton- Pauline Theology and Hellenism, p.373, Am. Jour. Theol. Vol. XXI.

enacted the sacred drama. The lesser mysteries were preparatory; the greater initiated the votaries. They partook of purification rites, a sacred meal, and in the passion drama they participated in the grief of Demeter, and became identified with the goddesses.

"...she showed them the manner of her rites and taught them her goodly mysteries, holy mysteries which none may violate, or search into, or noise abroad, for the great curse from the Gods restrains the voice. Happy is he among deathly men who hath beheld these things! And he that is uninitiate, and hath no lot in them, hath never equal lot in death beneath the murky gloom." ¹

The noblest of the Oriental cults was that of the Persian god, Mithra. It was the most ethical of all. Mithraism owed much to Babylonian influence. Persian Mithra was the god of light, and was closely associated with Chaldean astrology. In Greek times, this became the sub-stratum of the cult, and on passing into Asia Minor, the mystery came into connection with the worship of the Great Goddess. Unlike the other cults, Mithraism remained free from sensuality and sexual association, and retained the vigorous ethical dualism of Persian religion. From the second to the fourth century A.D. it enjoyed a great influence.² At the height of its power, its devotees practised the rite of the taurobolium. In all probability this had been borrowed from the cult of Cybele Attis, with which Mithraism had become identified. Central in the representations of Mithraism is the slaying of the bull. The myth is obscure, but it was probably connected with the revival of vegetation. Mithra was not a 'dying and rising god..' He had no death and resurrection, in which his

1. Lang - Homeric Hymns, p. 208-209.

2. During the first century it "had no importance whatever." Cumont - op. cit. p. XX

initiates could participate. He won men's gratitude by the slaying of the bull. A sacred meal,¹ which the soldiers of Mithras partook, and a ritual² were also connected with the cult.

The kindred religions of astrology and the Hermetica were quite superior in character to that of the mysteries. The former developed into gnosticism, which was a later rival of Christianity. They were more pessimistic than the mystery religions. A more pronounced dualism existed between the material world and the spiritual. They were also more ethical and speculative. Enlightenment or gnosis brought man into union with the divine, and gave salvation. The mysticism found here was a mysticism of union. There were no rites or sacraments in these religions.

Astralism or the religion of astrology was less distinctive in its expression, for it penetrated and influenced all other religions and philosophies. It owed much to Posidonius of Apamia, born in the valley of the Orontes 135 B.C. Little is known concerning him. This sidereal mysticism was founded upon the ancient beliefs of the Chaldean astrologers. In the Hellenistic age, it was transformed under the twofold influence of astronomic discoveries and Stoic thought, and was promoted after becoming a pantheistic sun-worship, to the³ rank of an official religion of the Roman Empire. All the mystery religions were influenced by this astrology and star worship. It deified the celestial and terrestrial bodies, especially the luminous heavens. The gods were thought of as cosmic energies. The universe was a unity, an ordered and harmonious

1. Tertullian and Justin Martyr warn the Christians against this. Cave - op.cit p.272-273.

2. Dieterich postulates an elaborate ritual and liturgy on the basis of a recovered text. This conclusion is opposed by Cumont and Reitzenstein. Schweitzer - Paul and His Interpreters. p.187-188.

3. Cumont - Astrology and Religion, p.99.

whole governed by a supreme intelligence.

Man was a privileged creature, and was connected with the sidereal gods. It was presupposed by astral doctrines¹ that there had been a prior descent of the soul into man from its abode above. Man was a double being, soul and body. The soul had kinship with the sidereal world. This kinship was fully realized by an ascent to the spheres. There were different ways, from the crude to the spiritual, the semi-physical to the moral. Generally it required a purification of the soul from the contacts of the earth and vice. Then by cosmic contemplation, the soul enjoyed communion with the spheres. This culminated in a cosmic emotion or mystical ecstasy wherein the soul partook of the life and immortality of the gods and was deified. At death, this immortality was fully enjoyed. The soul was released from its prison-house, the body, and carried to the spheres, where it was privileged to look down upon the earth.

Astral mysticism appealed to the intellect; it stirred the emotions, and purified the soul. It was individualistic and contemplative; its goal was ecstasy and deification. By these means salvation and immortality were won. Its ethic was ascetic, a life of self-renunciation seeking release from the trammels of this world. Cumont, quoting Seneca, has given an illustration of this astral, mystic, cosmic deification.

"He to whom the gods themselves reveal the future,
who imposes their will even on kings and people,
cannot be fashioned " he says "by the same womb which
bore us ignorant men. His is a superhuman rank. Con-
fident of the gods he is himself divine. " ²

1. Angus - Religious Quests...p.295.

2. Cumont - Astrology and Religion, p.148. The reference is to the astrologer, Arellius Fuscus, of the Augustan age.

3. The Comparative Religion School and Hellenism.

Biblical scholarship owes much to the school of comparative religion for its investigations and rediscovery of the Hellenistic world, into which Christianity spread from Palestine, and which it conquered during the first centuries of its history. But the claim of this school has been most often that the conqueror became the conquered, and here it has erred. It is said that syncretism was the sign manual of the age, and that this Hellenistic world with its medley of redemptive religions explains Christianity, and Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, and his mysticism. This explanation was very popular, especially at the beginning of the century. Space will permit only a brief discussion of three of the most outstanding scholars of this school.

Loisy¹ illustrates what was once a very familiar method of approach. The apostle Paul transformed and Hellenized Christianity. His conversion resulted in the complete abandonment of Judaism and a reaction from it to Hellenism. Thus he became persuaded that Jesus was a saviour god akin to the redeemer gods of the mystery religions, Osiris, Attis, or Mithra.² Paul's conversion and call as an apostle to the

1. Loisy - The Christian Mystery, Hibb. Jour. Vol. X. There were many shades of opinion within the school of comparative religion. Loisy is one extreme. Macchioro is similar; he explains Paul in terms of Orphism - From Orpheus to Paul. For a more intermediate position see -Lake, The Earlier Epistles of Paul, the Stewardship of Faith. McGiffert - The History of Christianity. Gardner - The Religious Experience of Paul, and for a moderate view refer to Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, Wilson - St. Paul and Paganism.

2. Loisy - op. cit. p.60.

Gentiles cut him off completely from the pre-Pauline Christianity of the first days. Christianity became a mystery, with sacraments similar to the pagan mysteries. Baptism was a rite highly realistic and mystical. The apostle died and rose, as did the votaries of the mysteries, enacting the drama of the death and rebirth of their cult deity.¹ The Lord's Supper meant the participation in the flesh and blood of a celestial being, effecting a union of the believers with the immortal saviour. Thus Christianity in its worship and belief had become a religion of mystery.²

Reitzenstein's conclusions reveal a thorough knowledge of the Hellenistic world, and they are more difficult to refute. His writings have made popular the researches within the field of comparative religion, of such scholars as Cumont, Rohde, Anrich, Dieterich, and others. His method of approach is an unhappy one, for he ignores the whole problem of Christianity before Paul and the Pauline question within the epistles. Paul is to be explained in terms of Hellenism. He therefore sets about to discover parallel ideas within this literature, and straightway smothers the apostle with these. He assumes that Paul was a mystic before his conversion. The apostle had been acquainted with the mystery religions in his pre-Christian days, and after the Damascus crisis he makes³ a renewed study of these to fit him for his apostleship to the Gentiles.

1. op. cit. p. 53.

2. op. cit. pp. 56-57.

3. Reitzenstein - op. cit. p. 419.

All Paul's central conceptions¹ were therefore borrowed from these sources, and were welded together into a unity by his own mind. The apostle's pronounced dualism of soul and spirit² especially marks him as belonging to the Hellenistic world and sharing in its spirit and temper. This determined the character of his mysticism.

Bousset is the ablest of this whole school. He does not brush aside the problem of the pre-Pauline Christian Church and base his theory upon parallels found in Hellenistic literature. He appeals rather to the general similarity of the spiritual atmosphere of both. Paul is not mainly responsible for the Hellenization of Christianity. This process had begun already in the pre-Pauline Hellenistic centres such as Antioch. Through the medium of late Judaism, especially that of the Diaspora, Greek ideas had penetrated, and at such centres as Antioch and Damascus, Palestinian Christianity had been Hellenized. This Christianity regarded Jesus as Lord and the centre of a cultus. It had a doctrine that the sacraments are media of grace and a community mysticism.³ The apostle was converted to this Christianity, and developed these characteristics more fully.⁴ He transformed it into a personal mysticism. Thus Paul

1. Refer for a discussion of the question of Paul's supposed Hellenistic vocabulary and sacramentalism to Kennedy- St. Paul and the Mystery Religions; Reitzenstein's whole position, Schweitzer - The Mysticism of Paul; the Heavenly Man conception reputed to have been borrowed from Iranian speculations (Poimandres), Kennedy - St. Paul and the Conception of the Heavenly Man. Exp. Vol. VII.

2. See pp. 66-67. In Paul this theory rests upon two instances, 1 Cor. 2:14; 15:44-46 and in Hellenistic literature, an emendated text from the Mithras liturgy, op. cit. p.175-176.

3. Bousset- op. cit. p.77-103. 4. op. cit. p.104. "On this basis of the Kyrios faith and cultus in the Hellenistic Christian community rises the personal Christ piety of the Apostle Paul."

was separated from Jesus not only by the original community at Jerusalem, but also by the Hellenized Christianity of Damascus and Antioch. He knew not the Jesus of Palestine. His concern was the risen Lord, whom he identified with the Spirit.¹ The apostle's mysticism was a Spirit mysticism. This was Hellenistic,² for his thought of flesh and Spirit was dualistic, similar to that of the Greek world of his day. Thus Paul laid the foundations for the later gnostic dualism and Catholic sacramentalism of Christianity.

Bousset's thesis, although ably presented, fails to carry conviction. He cannot prove that the Judaism of the Diaspora was influenced to the extent to which he claims, by the surrounding Greek world.³ It is impossible to show that there existed a Hellenistic Kyrios cult and realistic sacramentalism either in the pre-Pauline Hellenistic communities⁴ or in Paul's Christianity.⁵ There was no break between Paul and the original Palestinian Church. It cannot be maintained that the apostle equated Christ with the Spirit, or that his thought contained a metaphysical dualism of flesh and Spirit.⁶

Both Bousset and Reitzenstein's theories rest upon the claim that Paul's conception of the Spirit was Hellenistic. It has been shown earlier⁷ in these pages that the apostle's thought of the Spirit was Hebraic. Hellenistic influences, if there were any, came by way of the Wisdom literature of Hellenistic Judaism,⁸ but Paul did not share any Stoic pantheistic view of

1. op. cit. p.112-113. 2. op. cit. p. 120-134.

3. Hellenistic tendencies did find their way into the Judaism of the Diaspora, but not to the degree that cultus and realistic sacramental ideas found lodgment there.

4. Schweitzer - The Mysticism of Paul, p.31. Refer also to Rawlinson- op. cit. especially regarding origin of title Lord. Appendix, p.231-237.

5. Paul disagreed with them only regarding the law and circumcision; they shared the same gospel.

6. Refer p.66-67. 7. Refer p. 67-68. 8. Refer p. 154.

Spirit. Dr. Porter is of the opinion that there is no parallel in ancient literature to the apostle's conception. Elsewhere he writes concerning Paul:

"It is through Hebrew supernaturalism that the lofty conclusion is reached that the tempers and qualities of love are the characteristics of the Spirit of God and that the various works of love in human character and in human society are the proper and most marvellous and divine effects of the Spirit's presence in the world."

4. A Final Criticism of the Comparative Religion School.

The conclusions of the comparative religion school within their own field of inquiry, namely, the Graeco-Roman world of the first few centuries, are very faulty. Their hypothetical constructions have been built upon uncertain foundations. The meagre data available are insufficient to sustain these, and the question of their dating makes these findings even more unconvincing. This is doubly true when they turn to the problem of Christian origins, and guided by these former conclusions, they attempt to explain Christianity and especially Paul in terms of that Hellenistic world which they have supposedly discovered.

Certain facts are forgotten by the comparative religion school. In all probability, Christianity influenced the mystery religions. Paul's gospel was not a reasoned interpretation of Christianity, made up of ideas borrowed from the Jewish and especially the Hellenistic world, and unified into a system, to meet the needs of the Gentiles. It was first of all the testimony of

1. Porter - op. cit. p.84.

2. Wood. The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature; Porter-Introduction, p.XIV.

3. Schweitzer - Paul and His Interpreters, p.192. Kennedy-St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p.68-70. Most likely their reconstructed picture of the mystery religions belongs to a later date than the Pauline period.

a life, a personal relationship, a mystical fellowship with Christ, and a new experience of God. The intellectual considerations were secondary. Analogies and parallels found in Paul's epistles and the mystery literature do not always imply a dependence. It is questionable whether the mystery religions had sacraments¹ similar to the Christian rites of baptism and the Eucharist.² Regarding the question of Christian borrowing and dependence, especially with reference to the Supper, Brilioth expresses the opinion of present-day scholarship.

"The attempt to derive baptism and the eucharist directly from heathen rites is now seen to be one of the freaks of historical scholarship... Serious discussion is now confined to the date and the extent of the influence of the mystery religions on the Christian sacrament.... It may in fact be asserted with the greatest confidence that the direct influence of the mystery cults upon the eucharist did not begin till a much later period."³

In explaining the apostle in terms of Hellenism, the mystery conceptions of redemption and of the redeemer gods have been regarded as valuable connecting links. It is forgotten that these deities were mythical creations belonging to the nature worship of the remote past, while Jesus was a historic figure. The mystery religions looked to the past and to mythology. Christianity/

-
1. The mystery rites of initiation brought the votary in a mystical union, orgastic or one of identity, with his cult deity. There is no mention of sacraments effecting this.
 2. The evidence is very meagre. Kennedy-St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 228-279; Schweitzer - Paul and His Interpreters, p. 197; Rawlinson - op. cit. p. 280. In an attempt to find parallels for the apostle's sacramental conception of the Eucharist, scholars have turned to an earlier and more primitive custom of eating the god; but this was not practised in Paul's day. Clemen-Primitive Christianity, p. 257-258; Schweitzer-The Mysticism of Paul, p. 268. No parallels can be adduced for the apostle's conception of baptism. Baptism may have formed part of the initiating rite in some of the cults, but there is no suggestion that baptism itself constituted the initiatory rite. Lucius was baptised and ten days later he was granted a vision of the gods, p. 133. There is no need to turn to the Hellenistic world for an explanation of Paul's sacramental mysticism.
 3. Brilioth - op. cit. p. 49-53.

Christianity looked to history, the world of time, and to the present and future.¹ Christianity had a good news rooted in history. In the Christian sense of the word, the mystery religion-deities were not redeemers. The conception is not found in the Hermetic writings or² in Astral mysticism. The deaths of the cult-gods were misfortunes, tragedies that were bewailed elaborately in the ritual.³ The death was not connected with a divine plan of salvation. The hero cult deities were not supreme; there was no vital union between them and the Supreme Power.⁴ The mystery votaries emphasized not the death, but the rebirth of the god. With the apostle it was the reverse. Redemption in the mysteries did not imply the forgiveness of sins. Repentance and faith were not man's answer. Salvation was automatic, not moral. The initiate was simply lifted out of his lower sphere of existence into a higher one.⁵ There was a rebirth, but it was not moral. He did not have a new moral attitude to the world and to God.⁶

Having dealt with these more general considerations, let us turn now to a more specific problem. Did Paul's mysticism have kinship with that of the mystery religions, and astral mysticism? The apostle's mysticism was a faith mysticism. This faith was rooted in Hebrew and Jewish piety, and was not known to the Greek world.⁷ It had nothing in common with the

1. In this respect especially, the apostle was a Jew. This point will be dealt with more fully in Chapter V.

2. Scott - Hermetica, Vol.I. p.13.

3. Easton-Pauline Theology and Hellenism, Am.Jour.Theol.Vol.XXI, p.374. Schweitzer - Paul and His Interpreters, p.197.

4. Moffatt- Grace in the New Testament, p.61.

5. Bevan - Hellenistic Age, p.105.

6. Gardner - The Religious Experience of St.Paul, p.87. In the Hermetica there is nothing about the brotherhood of man, Scott- op. cit. p.305.

7. Hatch -op.cit. p.65. This is especially true of the personal, inward, passionate character of the apostle's faith.

orgiastic and identity mysticism of the mysteries, or the union mysticism of astral worship.

There was nothing individualistic, ecstatic, semi-dualistic, or other-worldly about it. He was not lifted out of his normal life in the flesh, nor was he deified.¹ His mysticism was a cross and resurrection mysticism; a moral death and resurrection took place, not a rebirth. It was also a history mysticism, rooted in the historic Jesus, His life, death, resurrection, risen activity, and expected return. There is nothing parallel to this in the Greek world. The ethicalness of his mysticism especially separates him from Hellenism.² To conclude this comparison, let us quote the opinion of Dr. Easton.

"But of one thing I feel very certain, to leave the Old Testament, the apocalyptic and other later Jewish literature and the primitive Christian experience, in order to seek for the origin of St. Paul's basic mysticism in astral worship or the Hermetic writings is to parody historical method."³

The school of comparative religions has cherished too fondly certain presuppositions and fallacies. These have led them astray. They were sceptical of the possibility of recovering the Jesus of History, or else not primarily

1. In the identification mysticism of the mysteries the initiates did not regard themselves as gods in the intervals between their ecstatic deifications. Easton - op. cit. p.380.

2. Originally there was nothing moral about the mysteries. Coming in contact with Stoicism they took on an ethical character but this was later than the time of Paul. It is also possible that their conception of deification and being in the god was given an ethical content later. From the second century on, the cult of Isis was influenced. Cumont-Oriental Religions, p.92. Astral mysticism and that of the Hermetica was more moral, but it was the morality of asceticism, individualistic and world renouncing. Scholars have attempted also to explain Paul's ethic in terms of Stoicism. Enslin finds no dependence upon the latter. The Ethics of Paul. The apostle's ethic is Jewish and Christian and takes its rise in the cross of Christ.

3. op. cit. p.380. If this be true of astral religion and that of the Hermetica, it is especially true of the mystery religions.

interested in this problem. The explanation of Christianity was to be found not by the literary analysis of the New Testament documents, but by the comparative study of religion. The Graeco-Roman world of the first few centuries contained the secret. Christianity was the product of a mighty synthesis of mythologies, beliefs and habits from a rich variety of sources — Jewish, Oriental and Greek—whose centre was the traditional story of Jesus. Thus the religion of Jesus became a religion about Jesus, having a cultus and sacramentalism. The apostle Paul was one of the major factors in this transformation. These conclusions have always been opposed by the eschatological school, and today they are denied by the rise of the form criticism school and the return of scholarship to the primitive beginnings for an explanation of Christianity.¹

It was the hypothesis with which the comparative religion^{school} started that led them to such faulty conclusions. They maintained that the theory of synthesis would explain Christianity. Christianity was the product of its environment,² the Graeco-Roman world, a synthesis of the best elements from the religions within this world. The theory is one of the byproducts of evolutionary thought. Higher religions are explained in terms of the lower. By a levelling up and levelling down process all are brought to one dead level. The theory rules out the Divine and revelation, and does not recognize the contributions of great genii like Paul or Moses, vehicles of the Divine.

For most scholars today, the comparative religion school and their

1. Moffatt- Grace in the New Testament, p.92..."the Formgeschichte movement is welcome as it cuts the ground from under the view that a religion of Jesus was turned into a religion about Jesus."

2. The same theory was applied to the Old Testament; the unique character of Israel's religion was ignored and covered over with parallels from the surrounding religions. Welch - The Present Position of Old Testament Criticism, Exp. Vol. VI.

conclusions belong to past history. They illustrate a certain swing or tendency just as the theological liberalism of Holtzmann, Julicher, and Von Harnack did before them. Today the renewed interest in Jesus and primitive beginnings has given rise to a higher estimate of Jesus, which admits of a mystery inherent in His personality,^{of} which during His lifetime His disciples were conscious. Later followers only expressed this in a more theological form. The only explanation of this mystery is the gracious inbreaking of the Divine into human life and history, to redeem mankind. This created Christianity and sent it to the Graeco-Roman world, and St. Paul is one of the summit waves of this whole movement, and his mysticism one of the finest fruits of this new Divine seed¹ which God had planted in the world of man.

D. Summary.

Before leaving the field of New Testament criticism and passing on to that of mysticism and the final section of our inquiry, the results of this investigation thus far ought to be summarized. The mysticism of the apostle Paul was not rooted in the mysticism of Judaism or Hellenism, although mysticism flourished especially in the soil of the latter. Therefore, Hellenism has been regarded as the possible parent of this mysticism. On the contrary, we have traced Paul's mysticism back to its beginnings in Jesus. Some roots are to be found in Judaism and the Old Testament. It took its rise in his conversion crisis at Damascus. There were also two factors which greatly determined the character of this mysticism. One was his experience of Judaism and the law, while^{he was} yet a Pharisee. The other was the contact with the first

1. This is the thesis of Hoskyns - The Riddle of the New Testament. Rawlinson - The New Testament Doctrine of Christ, Kennedy, Scott, Manson, Moffatt, Porter and many others.

Christians and the Christianity which their gospel proclaimed and their lives illustrated, while Paul was yet a persecutor of the early Church. These make intelligible the apostle's later reaction from Judaism. They form the bridge uniting Paul with Jesus. They help greatly in explaining why his mysticism was of such a character—his history mysticism; his cross and resurrection mysticism; wherein the cross was central and those great words, grace and love; his faith and Christ mysticism which was so personal, inward and passionate, and wherein Christ was the beginning, the ground and the goal of his mystical life; and lastly, his ethical and sacramental mysticism.

.....

CHAPTER V

MYSTICISM.

"Mysticism is simply religion at its most acute,
intense and living stage." Rufus Jones.

"His (John's) mysticism like that of Paul is a
mysticism centred, not in Absolute Being but in
the Divine Christ....And just in so far as the
object is visualized...as concrete personal, the
religious experience...is continuous rather with
the Old Testament. " B. H. Streeter.

I. HISTORICAL SURVEY

A. Brahmanism.

1. Documents, History and Teaching.

The Upanishads are among the greatest of the religious documents of the East. The "Vedanta", or gospel of the Upanishads, had its roots in an earlier religion, that of the Veda, a more primitive attempt at a religion and a venture at the riddle of the universe. The earliest of the Upanishads date back to 500 B.C. They are both prose and poetry, and they present a bewildering variety of speculative and religious thinking, with little or no unity throughout. Pantheism, monism, monotheism, and theism are mingled together. They are united only in one respect, in their common quest for ultimate reality and redemption. This is the dominant note of the Upanishads. They are more than philosophical. Primarily, they are religious. There is a quest for, not just disinterested knowledge, but rather knowledge which redeems man from the^{1&2} curse of rebirth.

This lack of unity has led to diverse interpretations. There are two

1. Macnicol - Indian Theism, p.46.

2. Cave - Redemption Hindu and Christian, p.76.

outstanding schools of commentators, Sankara and Ramanuja. The former lived^{1&2} in the 8th Century A.D., the latter in the 11th. Sankara resolved the teachings of the Upanishads into a single, simple doctrine, consistent throughout, thus forming a complete monistic philosophy. On the one hand, there was the higher knowledge which recognized the existence of absolutely nothing save Brahman or the Atman, the one unity which was at once real, thought, and bliss. The saving truth which redeemed man from the constant stream of rebirth, "Karma", was the recognition of this fact; the sole reality of "Brahman", "Atman", and that man himself is the one "Atman." On the other hand, there was a lower knowledge. By postulating this, Sankara explained away all inconsistencies and contradictions in the Upanishads, and safeguarded his monistic interpretation. Here the doctrine of "maya" or the illusion of the world and the temporal was introduced. Several modern commentators of the Upanishads have followed Sankara in their manner of interpretation—Gough³ and Deussen⁴. Deussen of Kiel is the exponent of modern idealistic monism and a learned representative of the mysticism of the Schopenhaurian type. Deussen summarized the teachings of the Upanishads into a single equation, "Brahman = Atman." In the^{5&6} 11th Century, Ramanuja, unlike Sankara, offered a more theistic interpretation.

To the writer, each school of interpretation tells part of the truth. The Upanishads are extremely philosophical yet primarily they are religious. When the interest is religious, the thought of the Upanishads is theistic. Man, the worshipper, seeks God, an object of worship. When the interest is philosophical/

-
1. Keith—The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, p.507-508.
 2. Otto - Mysticism East and West, p.4.
 3. Gough - The Philosophy of the Upanishads
 4. Deussen - The Philosophy of the Upanishads.
 5. Milburn - The Religious Mysticism of the Upanishads, p.32.
 6. Cave - op. cit., p.77.

philosophical, the thought of the Upanishads moves in the direction of monism and pantheism. Unity is the dominant quest. The relation of man to his universe, the knower and known, is sought. Brahman becomes an abstract and empty conception. The doctrine of "maya" or illusion comes to the fore, with its denial of the material world and of the self. This teaching appears especially in the later Upanishads. Some writers have therefore claimed that it is implicit in the earlier Upanishads, and forms one of its central conceptions. It must be admitted that, since the Upanishads are extremely philosophical, there is a tendency in this direction.¹ The religious and theistic interest keeps this in check. The writer is in agreement, therefore, with Macnicol² in maintaining that it can "almost be accepted that the doctrine of maya (illusion) is unknown in the Upanishads."

Closely allied to the above claim that the Upanishads contain the doctrine of "maya" is another, that the teachings of these documents are pantheistic. Thoroughgoing pantheism maintains that God and the world are identical. He is immanent in the world but not transcendent.

"The learned behold God alike in the reverend Brahmin,
in the ox and in the elephant, in the dog and in him
who eateth the flesh of dogs."³

On the contrary, in the Upanishads, even where they border on pantheism, the world is regarded as organically one with God and rest-^{ing} in Him, though He also transcends it.

"Properly speaking Brahman is conceived of rather as transcendent than as immanent, for if all things are

1. Keith - op. cit., p.529.

2. Macnicol - op. cit. p.50.

3. Inge - Christian Mysticism, p.118.

"real in it, that reality is something even beyond and elusive. Again and again it is said 'that Atman is a bank, a boundary, so that these worlds may not be confounded'....Therefore when that bank has been crossed, night becomes day indeed, for the world of Brahman is lighted up once for all." ¹

In the less intellectual and philosophical of the Upanishads, where the religious motive is uppermost, theism is dominant. This is especially true of the Katha Upanishad and parts of the Sh'vatash. Here God is the creator.

"Seeking for freedom I go for refuge to that God who is the light of his own thoughts, he who first creates Brahman and delivers the Vedas to him." ²

God is both immanent and transcendent.

"Those who know beyond this the High Brahman, the vast, hidden in the bodies of all creatures, and alone enveloping everything, as the Lord, they become immortal." ³

Space does not permit a fuller discussion of the religious and theistic teachings of the Upanishads. It is sufficient to say that they are not primarily metaphysical but religious, "a school of mysticism," to quote the words of Oldenberg. ⁴

2. Mysticism.

a. Aim.

Brahman mysticism had for its background that oriental pessimistic view of life summed up in the doctrine of Karma. Human life was one endless cycle of death and rebirth, one long travail of misery and transmigration. Time was in flux. The temporal world was full of pain and purposeless. Salvation therefore meant negatively escape from all this. Human craving and desire

1. Macnicol-op. cit. p.50; Chand VIII.4:1-2; see also Brihad IV:4:22, Mait VII:7, translation used, Muller ed. Sacred Books of the East, Vol. I and XV.

2. Svet VI. 18:3, see also VI. 2.

3. Svet III, 7.

4. Milburn - op. cit. p.23.

set in motion the cycles of rebirth, death and misery. The Brahman therefore sought freedom from desire, the root of all evil.

"...so much for the man who desires. But as to the man who does not desire, who not desiring, freed from desires, is satisfied in his desires, or desires the Self only, his vital spirits do not depart elsewhere,- being Brahman, he goes to Brahman.

On this there is this verse 'When all desires which once entered his heart are undone, then does the mortal become immortal, then he obtains Brahman.'" ¹

Positively, the sage sought a realization of God, a union of "Atman" in his own soul with Atman in the universe, the Brahman.

b. Method.

To achieve this there were four stages. All members of the three upper classes alone were eligible. There was the life of the student, then that of the householder. When old age approached, there followed the life of the hermit. Home was abandoned. The performance of sacrifices to the gods was given up. The sage devoted himself wholly to mystical reflection.

"He is not apprehended by the eye nor by speech, nor by the other senses, nor by penance or good works. When a man's nature has become purified by the serene light of knowledge, then he sees him meditating upon him as without parts. That subtle Self is to be known as thought...." ²

"That Self cannot be gained by the Veda nor by understanding nor by much learning. He whom the Self chooses by him the Self can be gained. The Self chooses him (his body) as his own." ³

Further the life of the ascetic was the final stage. He now meditated wholly upon the highest theme - the relation of the soul (Atman) to the principle

1. Brihad IV, 4:6-7.

2. Mund III, 1:8-9.

3. " " 2:3.

of the universe (Brahman). This was the great mystery of the Upanishads — the Atman in man was identical with the Atman in the universe, the Brahman. The soul of man was not a particle, an emanation of the universal principle or God, but was that principle. Undalaka Aruni says to his son.

"That which is that subtle essence, in it all that, exists has its self. It is the True. It is the Self and thou, Svetaketu art it."¹

The sage meditated upon this great truth. This meditation was both intellectual and etnical. The gospel of the Upanishads was a religion of the mind.

c. Goal.

The goal of the Hindu mystic's meditation was an intuition of and union with God, a uniting of the "Atman" in his own soul with the "Brahman" of the universe. Certain scholars, notably Deussen, have maintained that this goal was attained by complete absorption. On the contrary, Macnicol² claims that even in those passages where the seer Yajnovalka, who is supposed to^{be} the founder of the doctrine of complete absorption, approaches near to that view (Brihad IV 5:11, 4:13), it is very doubtful whether such is the case.

The mystic experience of union is ineffable. "That Self is to be described by Neti, Neti (no, no). He is incomprehensible, for He cannot be comprehended." (Brihad III, 9:26) says Yajnovalky to Maitreyi. It is an intuition. It comes like a flash of light.

"This is the lesson as regards the knowledge of God— In the case of a flash of lightning—to take an example from natural phenomena — the flash comes and one cries 'Oh'! The momentary sight of God is like that — a blink and an 'Oh'."³

The union is very brief. Following this the mystic is filled with joy.

1. Kh'hand VI, 11:3.

3. Milburn - op. cit. p.67.

2. Macnicol - op. cit. p.58-59.

d. Ethic.

The ethic of the Upanishads was almost negligible. In the first and second stages of the mystic's method, certain social requirements had to be fulfilled. In the final stages, the ethic was purely individualistic and self-centred. It could not be otherwise with a pessimistic world-view, and world-flight as the way to salvation, and a non-moral conception of deity.

3. Summary.

The Upanishads, having been written partly in prose and partly in verse, some earlier and others later, consist of a bewildering variety of speculation, ranging from monism and pantheism to theism. In certain of the Upanishads, the philosophical interest is dominant; in others, the religious. The one bond of unity is their common quest for salvation and union with reality. The diversity of their thought has led to different schools of interpretation. The religion of the Upanishads is that of the mind. The view of the world and of life is pessimistic. Salvation consists in release from Karma and union with God or Brahman. The way of attainment is by world flight and a moral and intellectual meditation upon the great truth of the Upanishads. The goal is reached by an intuitive vision which is ineffable and brief. The deity with whom the sage has union has little or no personality. Ethically the mysticism of the Upanishads is negligible.

Two facts are especially worthy of note in the writings of the Upanishads. There is the religious or mystical quest for union with Reality or God. There is also the philosophical speculation. This consisted of a pessimistic world view which was combined with an intellectual passion for unity.

When this was primary, reality or God was regarded as a bare abstraction,^{and} the world and the self as almost illusory. Then the metaphysics of the Upanishads bordered on monism and pantheism. When the religious interest was primary, the thought of the Upanishads became theistic and the conception of God more personal. It was the Hindu mystic's religion which sent him in search of God. It was his philosophy which coloured somewhat his conception of God and determined his method (denial of self, world renouncement, and world flight) of reaching the object of his search.

B. Buddhism.

1. Documents, History, and Teaching.

Buddhism owes its origin to one named Siddhartha. His family name was Gautama. Sakyamuni was his clan name, and he is known by this in the East. Buddha is his religious title, meaning the enlightened, the awakened. He lived over five centuries before Christ. At the age of twenty-nine he left home, wife and child, and wandered forth in search of salvation and the secret of escape from the misery and futility of life. First, he tried philosophical inquiry. Then he turned to the self-torturing asceticism recommended by the idealistic teachers of his day. After an interval of absolute despair, one day as he sat in intense meditation under the Bo-tree, there came the Great Illumination. He saw in a flash the secret of existence, and grasped the cause of life's misery. With the knowledge of this cause, there came also the understanding of the one sure way of complete deliverance. At that moment he had become Buddha. He was that one who had attained complete enlightenment.

"When this knowledge had risen within me, my heart
and mind were freed from the drug of lust, from the

"drug of rebirth, from the drug of ignorance. In me, thus freed, arose knowledge and freedom, and I knew that rebirth was at an end, and that the goal had been reached." ¹

This illumination brought with it the assurance that Enlightenment was not merely the means to deliverance but itself the goal. The fetters of Karma had been broken. He had been freed from the law of rebirth. The power to enter into Nirvana, or eternal peace, was his. Would he enter, or wait and share this Enlightenment with others? This was the Great Temptation. He chose the latter. After the death of Buddha, the religion which he founded underwent a radical transformation. Buddha became semi-deified, and two schools arose. The more conservative, Southern Buddhism, was called Hinayana, "the little vehicle". A scheme of individual salvation was offered. The Northern or Catholic Buddhism gave itself the name, Mahayana, "the great vehicle." It had a more comprehensive scheme of salvation. The tradition and teachings of Buddha are to be found in the Pali texts.

Buddhism has been termed an Indian rationalism.² Like the thought of the Upanishads, it is both a philosophy and a religion. It is likewise pessimistic. There is a universe of many worlds without a first cause going on forever by alternating integration and disintegration. This cosmic procedure is orderly, as to its physical, psychical, and moral nature. It is not a matter of caprice or change. There is an ordered growth, equilibrium and decay, and this continues indefinitely. Such a philosophy is full of contradictions. This is noted by an eminent writer on Buddhism.

1. Maha-saceaka Sutta. The Discourses of Gotama. Saunders - Gotama Buddha, p.25 quoted from Streeter - The Buddha and the Christ, p.56.

2. Poussin - The Way to Nirvana, p.31.

"We see that Buddhism, through its theory of becoming, claims to reconcile a position of scientific doubt regarding the origin and end of life with an emphatic repudiation of materialistic and nihilistic conclusions as to the apparent physical beginning and end of life and with an equal emphatic affirmation of moral responsibility as coeval with life." ¹

Buddha borrowed the doctrine of Karma from the Upanishads, and gave it a moral interpretation. For him, Karma meant rebirth, not transmigration. This distinction was due to the Buddhistic conception of the self. Moral retribution was linked with rebirth. A man's deeds lived after him. His former deeds determined what he was in the present life.

"My past works," says the Buddhist, "were the matrix, the origin, the womb, the determinant of me, as are my present works of what I shall be." I have acted, and the effect, a transmitted composite resultant force, no less than is the electric current, is this 'I' some one, that is to say, who is identical with that former 'me,' in the only sense in which the Buddhist admits of identity." ²

In this manner, Buddha moralized his doctrine of Karma, and linked it with his novel conception of the human self.

Buddha regarded his world as ever in flux, always becoming—growth, equilibrium and decay. His view of the self was similar—birth, life, death with endless recurrence. This doctrine of the self should rather be termed not-self, or selflessness, "nairatmya." The self had no permanent individuality. It was but a compound of material and spiritual elements. Buddha used the analogy of a chariot to illustrate his view.

"Being?" Why dost thou harp upon that word?

'Mong false opinions, Mara, art thou strayed.

1. Mrs. Rhys Davids - Buddhism, p.145.

2. " " " " p.130.

"This a mere bundle of formations is,
Therefore no 'being' mayest thou obtain,
For e'en as, when the factors are arranged,
By the word 'chariot' is the produce known.
So doth our usage covenant to say 1
'A being' when the Aggregates are there."

The self, like the chariot, has no individuality apart from its parts. It is only a compound, a series of physico-psychical states which end at death, when the physical organism dissolves. Yet, according to Buddha's view of Karma, there is a rebirth which is determined by the moral life of the former state.

A new physico-psychical apparatus comes into existence, which is a continuation of the former and is determined by the moral actions of the former. In this manner, Buddha grafts morality into his doctrine of Karma. Life is one endless birth and death with its resultant rewards and punishments. This has been summed up in the doctrine of the Chain or Wheel of Causation. The Wheel rotates bringing life, death and rebirth, and with these pain, sorrow and suffering. Human desire or passion sets it in rotation, creating the self and its misery.

"There is no fire like unto passion's greed
No hapless cast of dice like unto hate,
No ill that equals all that makes the self
Nor is there any bliss greater than peace
These things to know e'en as they really are
This is Nibbana, crown of happiness." 2

The doctrine characteristic of the Indian outlook and temper is to be found therefore in Buddhism. The real is the unchanging. All that pertains to the sphere of the phenomenal are essentially maya or illusion. History, the field of fact and change, belongs to the realm of maya. The universe

1. Psalms of the Sisters, p.51-52. Mrs. Rhys Davids - op. cit. p.190.

2. Dhammapada, p.202-203. Mrs. Rhys Davids - op. cit. p.177.

is only one of an infinite series. Worlds wax and wane, are born and perish in endlessly recurrent cycles. There is no beginning and no end. All is without goal. Through this eternal cycle runs the law of Karma, the law by which in an endless series of reincarnations, the soul reaps what it has sown. To these Buddha added his own specific conceptions, his thought of the self and Karma as moral. Professor Aumy has summed up the Buddhistic philosophy in a threefold proposition, "All things are impermanent...pain engendering..without soul." ¹

2. Mysticism

a. Aim.

Since human passion or desire sets the Wheel of Causation rotating, creating rebirth or Karma with its misery and pain, Buddha sought deliverance from passion.

"So also, my disciples, is that much more which I have learned and have not told you, than that which I have told you. And wherefore my disciples, have I not told you that? Because, my disciples, it brings you no profit, it does not conduce to progress in holiness, because it does not lead to the turning from the earthly, to the subjection of all desires, to the cessation of the transitory, to peace, to knowledge, to illumination, to Nirvana, therefore have I not declared it unto you." ²

b. Method.

In his hour of illumination, while meditating under a tree, Buddha came to his saving truth. This he sought to share with men. It was a knowledge which liberated. It cut the roots of human desire, and freed men from life and this world of woe. This emancipation came by insight. Buddha did not teach

1. Mrs. Rhys Davids - op. cit. p.234.

2. Oldenberg - Buddha, p.204-205.

rationalism pure and simple. The knowledge which liberated was not a "gnosis." Faith as well as reason was required. The sage must hear the doctrines of Buddha taught and explained, and he must have faith in them. This way of faith was a middle way between two extremes, asceticism and laxity. The four noble Truths of Buddhism must be accepted by faith, the four great certainties—the Truth of suffering, the Truth of the cause of suffering, the cessation of suffering, and the Path which leads to the cessation of suffering, namely the Holy Eightfold Path. This consisted of right belief, feeling, speech, action, mode of livelihood, effort, recollectedness, meditation.

c. Goal.

The last two stages of the Eightfold Path were the crowning steps. By these the Buddhist reached Nirvana. The former began in contemplation. The latter ended in rapture or ecstasy, where consciousness was finally lost.

"When the thunderclouds in heaven beat the drum,
when the floods of water choke the paths of the air,
and the monk in a mountain cave surrenders himself
to abstraction, he can have no greater joy." ¹

In this manner Nirvana is achieved.

"Nibbana have I realized and gazed
Into the Mirror of the holy Norm.
I, even I, am healed of my hurt.
Low is my burden laid, my task is done.
My heart is wholly set at liberty." ²

The meaning of the term Nirvana will always remain in doubt. On this
point, Buddha's teaching is not clear. ³ M. Duroiselle, an eminent European
Buddhist scholar, has expressed the problem thus: 1. Nirvana is complete ex-
tinguishment/

1. Theragatha - saying of the Thera Bhuta, Oldenberg - op. cit. p.305.

2. Psalms of the Seven Sisters XXXI, Mrs. Rhys Davids - op. cit. p.185-186.

3. Mrs. Rhys Davids - op. cit. p.194-195.

extinction, nothingness. 2. Nirvana is a glorious life, supreme felicity.

3. Nirvana is the mystery of Buddha and no one knows what it is. It is a well known fact that the early Buddhists held the idea of the continuance of existence, and denied the doctrine of utter destruction current in their day.¹ This fact makes the second view the more favoured. Nirvana meant the release of the real and eternal self from the empirical self entangled in the world, in the sphere of Maya. The real self was thought of as identical with the absolute, and on being freed was reunited with it.

"The storm is over; the tossed and troubled wave
sinks back into the bosom of the unruffled ocean
of Eternal Being."²

d. Ethic.

Unlike the teachings of the Upanishads, the Buddhist system of thought provided some basis for its morality. In moralizing its doctrine of Karma, it gave a place to ethics. In the middle stages of the Eightfold Path, ethics also played a part. The final stages were purely individualistic and self-centred. Ethics were left behind when the Buddhist attained Nirvana. Further, the Buddhist ethic as a whole was negative, an avoiding of and refraining from evil action. Buddhist philosophy, like that of the Upanishads, with its pessimism and method of salvation by world flight, had little use for a morality. To add to this, its goal, Nirvana, offered no criterion or standard for such.

3. Summary.

Buddhism is both a philosophy and a religion. As a system of thought it contained contradictions. It linked the conception of scientific doubt as

1. Keith - Buddhist Philosophy, p.78,

2. Streeter - op. cit. p.284.

to the origin and end of life with the thought of order and moral purpose running through all. It has been defined in brief thus: all is impermanent, pain engendering, without soul. To counteract this pessimistic world view and offer a way of escape from the Wheel of Causation and Karma, Buddha put forward his conception of Nirvana and the way of attaining this. This was the Middle Way with its four truths and its Eightfold Path which culminated in an intuition of higher truth and finally ecstasy, by which the sage experienced Nirvana. The doctrine of Nirvana will always remain one of the uncertainties of Buddhism, but it is more than probable that it did not mean the complete annihilation of the true self. Ethics had a more prominent place in Buddhism, yet in the main they are negligible. In Buddhism also, as in the teachings of the Upanishads, two facts are to be noted. Buddhism is both a religion and a philosophy. There is the religious or mystical quest for salvation or Nirvana. When this was won, the real self returned to the Absolute from whence it came.¹

Buddhism was also a philosophy, a search for truth, but unlike the thought of the Upanishads, this was less dominant. Its main concern was salvation and the winning of Nirvana. Philosophically it was full of contradictions and thoroughly pessimistic—the endless becoming of life, the selflessness of the human self, and the moral doctrine of Karma. Confronted with these, salvation could be thought of only in terms of world flight. Nirvana could be described only in uncertain language. There was no union with a deity who had personality. Buddha was agnostic regarding the gods of the Hindu pantheon.

1. Poussin writes "There is no mysticism in Buddhism, if the word 'mysticism' is understood quite strictly, immediate non-discursive intuitive relation to the Absolute." E.R.E. Vol. IX, p. 85. He is accepting a narrow definition of mysticism and also assuming that Nirvana meant annihilation.

They also were subject to the wheel of Karma. Nirvana meant only the identity of the true self with the Absolute. Buddha's philosophy therefore coloured greatly his thought of Nirvana and salvation, and determined his method of winning such. His religious quest, his mysticism was moulded and shaped to a great extent by his philosophy.

C. Sufism.

1. Documents, History and Teaching.

Persian mysticism took its rise in the second century A.D., and found expression in poetry and prose from that date onward. The word "sufi" first appeared in this literature as a name applied to a certain class of ascetics, who wore garments of white wool, "suf." Sufism began in a spontaneous and widespread revolt against worldliness and luxury, and a movement towards world flight and asceticism. The Koran awoke a consciousness of sin and dread of wrath to come. "There is no god but Allah." Complete and unquestioned submission to the Divine will was required. This led to quietistic practices, which were borrowed from their ascetic and mystical Christian neighbours. Sufism could not long remain just a type of quietism fulfilling the legal requirements of the Koran. Speculative and pantheistic tendencies from Neo-Platonism crept in. The Sufi conception of "fana", passing away, was possibly borrowed from India and Buddhism. Yet neither Christian, Greek nor Indian influences explain later Sufi mysticism. The Koran and Sufism had within themselves the potentialities for development along mystical lines. The Koran contained the germ, the thought of one God working His arbitrary will with unapproachable supremacy, and also the conception of an all-pervading power which was ever in intimate

relations with His creatures. "Wherever you turn there is the face of Allah." (ii, 109) "We (God) are nearer to him (man) than his neck vein." (i, 15)¹ Sufi mysticism sprang from roots like these. Perfect detachment from the world, absolute trust in Allah, and entire acquiescence in His will involved perfect attachment to God or in mystical language, union with God through love. Asceticism and quietism, the goal of the early Sufi, now became a path to a higher goal, union with God through love.

The foundations of the mystical religion of Sufism were laid in the third century A.D. Dhu-'L-Nun of Egypt introduced into Sufism the idea of gnosis, (ma'rifa) knowledge given in ecstasy differing from intellectual and traditional knowledge. A contemporary, Abu Yaz'ed (Bayazid), possibly under the influence of Indian monism, developed the doctrine of "fana," the passing away of the self. He endeavoured to reach the Deity by a process of negation pushed to extreme lengths, which culminated in deification, a state in which the seeker became one with the Sought.

"I shed my Ego (my Self) as a serpent sheds its skin"
he says "then I regarded my essence and I was myself
He."²

Abu Sa'id al-Kharroz developed the mystical doctrine of "baqa", the unitive life in God, the counterpart of "fana."

With the development of Sufism, the movement tended to drift from its anchorage in Islam towards pantheism. The growing influence of Greek philosophical ideas, especially that of emanation, encouraged this. Aber Hamid Ghazali, an eleventh century mystic, held this movement in check. After Abu

1. Nicholson - Sufism, E.R.E. Vol. XII, p.10.

2. Birnui Hind. i, 43. Smith - Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East, p.242.

Hamid Ghazali, pantheistic philosophical tendencies came to the fore. Ibnu'l-Farid, an Arabian mystic of the early part of the thirteenth century, used repeatedly pantheistic language to express his feeling of oneness with God, yet his mysticism is personal rather than pantheistic. The mysticism of Ibnu'l-Arabi of the fourteenth century and Abd al Karim al Jeli and Jalalu'ddin Rumi of the fifteenth became even more pantheistic and philosophical. It was no longer an affair of the heart and conscience, but a speculative philosophy out of touch with those intimate moral and religious feelings that inspired the earlier mystics.

"The typical saint is no longer one who sought God with prayer and aspiration and found Him, after sore travail, in the transfiguration of dying to self, through an inexplicable act of grace, depending on nothing but the personal Creator; he is rather the complete theosophist and hierophant from whom no mystery is hidden, the perfect man who identifies himself with God or the Logos.

'I was on that day when names were not
Nor any sign of existence endowed with name
By me Names and Named were brought to view 1
On that day when there were not 'I' and 'we'."

The charge of pantheism has been levelled at Sufism often, and there is much in its literature which resembles such. Pantheistic language has been used to describe the mystical experience of union, the metaphor of the moth extinguished in the flame, and the drop of water lost in the ocean. The teaching of Divine transcendence in the Koran, if pushed to its logical conclusions, minimized and obliterated human personality and the world. Furthermore Sufism borrowed Hellenistic and Indian conceptions, which were pantheistic in character. Because of this, there was always in Sufism a tendency in the direction

2. Mysticism.

a. Aim.

Sufism took its rise in a movement of revolt against the worldliness and luxury of the day. It was characterized by a fear of the wrath to come, a denial of the world and world flight. In its positive aspect, Sufism sought to obey, serve, love and especially to enjoy fellowship and union with Allah.

b. Method.

The Sufi mystic sought union with God. In the earlier period, this was achieved by asceticism and quietism which culminated in ecstasy. In later times, with the infiltration from without of philosophical and pantheistic conceptions, the doctrines of absorption, deification, and annihilation came into favour. Dhu'l Nun of the third century developed the doctrine of "gnosis", knowledge, a gift from God given to a divinely illumined heart while in ecstatic contemplation of God. Abu Yazid formulated the doctrine of "fana", the passing away of individuality. Its complement, the doctrine of "baqa", the unitive life in God, came into prominence shortly afterwards. The doctrine of the Law, Path, and Truth followed. The Law referred to the allegorical interpretation of and esoteric knowledge connected with the Koran. The doctrine of the Path developed from the earlier ascetic and quietistic practices. It consisted of ascetic and ethical discipline, acquired virtues and mystical states, a "via Purgativa et Illuminativa." There were seven stages in all—conversion and repentance, abstinence, renunciation, poverty, patience, trust, satisfaction. This last stage took the form of ecstasy or union. Now the mystic reached the Truth, "fana", or the passing away of individuality in the Universal Being. This experience of "fana" was both moral and mental. The soul was transformed through

an extinction of all passions and desires. The mind experienced a mental abstraction or passing away from the outward and external, a complete concentration upon God. Later Sufism carried this one step further. The soul, stripped morally and mentally, ceased to will for itself. It became the object of the Divine will, that is, the beloved of God; and that which loves it and which it loved is now its inward and real self, not the self that had passed away. Thus the unified personality finds the subject and object of worship in itself. This explains the later doctrine of deification, expressed in such utterances as "Glory to me" (Bayazid), "I am God" (Hallaj), "I am She" (Ibnu'l¹ Farid).

The doctrine of "baqa" formed the counterpart of the doctrine of "fana". It was the positive aspect of the mystical experience of union with God. Now the mystic abides in God. The Sufi discovered that such a state might be induced artificially, by concentration, music, singing, dancing, or even methods bordering on auto-hypnosis. Granting this, it was recognized by most mystics that "baqa" was a gift of God.

"Betwixt me and Thee there lingers an 'It is I' that
torments me,²
Ah, of Thy grace, take away this 'I' from between us!"

The whole method of the mystic in his search for God, its many phases, mental and moral, can be summed up in one word - love. He reached his Goal by love.

"While the thought of the Beloved fills our hearts
All our work is to do Him service and spend life for Him
Wherever He kindles His destructive torch,
Myriads of lover's souls are burnt therewith
The lovers who dwelt within the sanctuary
Are moths burnt with the torch of the Beloved's face."³

1. Nicholson - The Idea of Personality in Sufism, p.27.

2. Hallaj, Arnold ed. Nicholson - op. cit. p. 218.

3. Jalalu'ddin, Underhill - Mysticism, p.104.

c. Goal.

The goal of the mystic was union with the Deity or "baqa", abiding in God. "Fana" involved the passing away of the Sufi from his phenomenal existence. "Baqa" implied the birth of his new or true self. He died to self, and lived in God. "We are the spirit of One, though we dwell in two bodies." Jili. ¹ Pantheistic and philosophical tendencies led to the doctrine of deification.

"Ye who in search of God, of God pursue, 2
Ye need not search, for God is you, is you!"

This conception of deification developed into a further one, absorption or self-annihilation in the Godhead.

"If God most Glorious manifests His Essence to anyone, that one will find all his own essence and attributes and actions utterly absorbed in the light of God's Essence and the Divine qualities and actions and will; and he sees his own essence to be the Essence of the One and his attributes to be the attributes of God, and his actions to be God's action, because of the complete absorption in Union with the Divine; and beyond this stage, there is no further stage of union for man. For when the eye of the soul-the spiritual vision- is rapt away to the contemplation of the Divine Beauty, the light of the understanding, whereby we distinguish between things, is extinguished in the dazzling light of the Eternal Essence, and the distinction between the temporal and the eternal, the perishable and the unperishable is taken away and this state is called union." ³

Strictly speaking, this state is not complete absorption or self-annihilation. The language should not be taken too literally. The case of Ibnu'l-Farid illustrates this. He distinguishes three phases of experience in this state, normal, abnormal and supernormal. They are continuous and describe the unitive experience. In the last state, the mystic descends from his exaltation/

1. Arnold ed. Nicholson - op. cit. p.219.

2. Jalalu'ddin, Nicholson - The Mystics of Islam, p.119.

3. Abd al-Rhman al Jami, Smith, op. cit. p.217.

exaltation to perform ritual and devotional acts of worship. On this subject of deification and absorption in God, Nicholson writes..

"The full circle of deification must comprehend both the inward and outward aspects of Deity-the One and the Many, the Truth and the Law. It is not enough to escape from all that is creaturely without entering into the eternal life of God the Creator as manifested in His works. To abide in God 'baqa' after having passed away from selfhood 'fana' is the mark of the Perfect Man who not only journeys to God, i.e. passes from plurality to unity, but in and with God, i.e. continuing in the unitive state, he returns with God to the phenomenal world from which he sets out and manifests unity in plurality. In this descent. ..he brings down and displays the Truth to mankind, while fulfilling the duties of the religious law."¹

d. Ethic.

Based upon the teachings of the Koran, the mysticism of Sufism was thoroughly ethical. The mystic path was one of moral culture. The doctrine of "fana", the passing away of the self, had an important ethical aspect. The old self with its passions and desires must die, and the new self in God, "baqa", must be completely one with the will of God. In this unitive life, the Sufi must love his neighbour as well as his God. There was a dual aspect to the unitive life, flight to God and return with God to the world.

"He makes the Law his outer garment
And the Mystic Path his inner garment."²

This was called the doctrine of "the double truth", and it enabled the Sufi to harmonize the Koranic conception of Allah with a semi-pentheistic philosophy and build up a lofty ethical system.

3. Summary.

1. Nicholson - The Mystics of Islam, p.163.

2. Arnold, ed. Nicholson, -op. cit. p.233.

Persian mysticism had for its foundations the Koranic doctrine of Divine unity and transcendence. It took its rise in the second century A.D., and found expression in poetry and prose. A revolt against luxury and worldliness, linked with fear of the Divine wrath, world denial and flight, marked its beginnings. Obedience to the will of Allah led to asceticism and quietism. This later developed into love and union with the Deity, mysticism proper. The mystic way with its doctrine of the Law, Path, and Truth was negative, a world flight. The negative aspect of the mystic union was known as "fana", the passing away of individuality; the positive, "baqa", abiding in God. Sufism borrowed from without the asceticism of Christianity and the philosophy and pantheism of India and Greece. The doctrines of deification and absorption can be traced to the latter two sources. The God of the Sufi was ever creator and personal, the object of his love. Union with God was an act of Divine grace. The unitive life was characterized by a flight to God and a return with God to the world. This is more pronounced in Sufism than in the mysticism of the Upanishads or Buddhism. This and the moral character of the mystic way brought ethics to the fore in Sufism. Sufism was both religious or mystical and philosophical. There was the mystical quest for union with the Deity, a passionate love for fellowship with Allah, Creator and Ruler over all. There was also the philosophical fact forming a background for the mystic's quest and life. This, the pessimistic view of life and the pantheistic borrowings from Greece and India, determined the mystic's choice of the negative way, and world flight as the mystic path to God. Yet ^{in spite of its metaphysical tendencies,} Sufism was primarily a religious movement, and the philosophical influences even in the later days of Sufism were of minor importance.

4. Summary of Oriental Mysticism.

Before concluding this discussion of Oriental mysticism and passing on, a few comparisons ought to be made. Two characteristics or facts have been noted in the mysticism of the Upanishads, Buddhism, and Sufism — the philosophical and the religious. The latter owes its existence to the heart or the whole of man; the former, to the mind or intellect of man. The religious ~~con-~~^{mysticism}ceptions of each have their specific philosophical settings. This is especially true in relation to the religious thought of Deity, the world, and the method of union with the Deity. The philosophical settings are important determining factors of these religious conceptions. In the Upanishads, the religious thought of the Deity is coloured greatly by the monistic and pantheistic philosophies, and tends to strip the Deity of all personality. This is the price demanded for philosophical unity. In Sufism also, this is true to a lesser degree. Buddha's philosophy accounts for his conception of Nirvana, from which the Deity or Absolute has been almost omitted. The religious conceptions of the world and of the self or personality of man are also determined by philosophical considerations. Where the metaphysical interest is uppermost and the quest for philosophical unity is paramount, there is ever the danger of the denial of the existence of the world and of self. This is especially true in the Upanishads. Sufism testifies to this also. Buddhist philosophy denies the reality of the human self outright. The philosophical conception of Karma, found in the Upanishads and Buddhism, seems to be of foreign origin. Having been incorporated into these systems at an early time, it became an integral part of them. It is the conception of Karma, more than all else, which is

responsible for the oriental pessimistic view of life. Philosophical considerations also determine the mystic's choice of path in his religious quest. A philosophy which is pessimistic, denying the existence of the world and self, leaves the mystic no other choice but world flight and self-annihilation. God cannot be found in this world; therefore it must be abandoned. Such a philosophy also has little use for an ethic. It is to be noted that in Sufism the philosophical interest is kept well in check; therefore world denial is not so much emphasized, the personality of God and of man is safeguarded, and the ethic is more developed. In bringing this examination of Oriental mysticism to a close, one thing further is to be noted. The mystics of all three religions seek and find union and fellowship with their God. To the Christian this may not appear to be a fellowship; nevertheless it is one of a more primitive kind. Even in Buddhism with its Nirvana, the self is not annihilated, but identified with the Absolute. Sufism exhibits a fellowship akin to that in Christianity. Fellowship with the Deity is the common trait of the three. The philosophical background of each religion determines the barriers which bar the way to their goal and the paths by which these barriers are surmounted. Since the philosophies of all three are pessimistic and that of two also pantheistic, they unitedly choose world flight. These conclusions suggest a tentative definition of mysticism, which will be revised as our study continues. Mysticism is the quest for union with the Deity and the satisfaction of that quest. It is the desire of the heart, the whole personality of man for direct fellowship and communion with God.

D. Christian Mysticism.

1. Documents, History, and Teaching.

Christian mysticism took its rise within the Christian Church, and shared with the latter its fortunes and changes down through history. Dean Inge has rightly divided Christian mysticism into two types, the Ascetic and the Humanist. The Renaissance and the Reformation mark the dividing line. Before the Renaissance, Christian mysticism was Ascetic; after, it was Humanist. In both periods, it owes its philosophical background to Plato.

"Both the great types of mystics may appeal to him - those who try to rise through the visible to the invisible, through nature to God, who find in earthly beauty the truest symbol of the heavenly, and in the imagination the image-making faculty - a raft where we may navigate the shoreless ocean of the Infinite; and those who distrust all sensuous representations as tending 'to nourish appetites which we ought to starve,' who look upon this earth as a place of banishment, upon material things as a veil which hides God's face from us and who bid us 'flee away from hence as quickly as may be' to seek 'yonder' in the realm of ideas, the heart's true home."

The former thought of Plato formed the philosophical basis for the mysticism of the Humanist; the latter, that of the Ascetic.

Ascetic mysticism borrowed its philosophy from one phase of Plato's thought, that which regarded the material world as a veil which hid the face of God. This conception was intensified on alliance with Manichaeism, with its contrasts of good and evil, light and darkness. This took its rise in

1. Inge - op. cit. p.78-79.

2. Bevan - Manichaeism - E.R.E. Vol.VIII, p.394-402. Oriental thought made a sharp division between the natural and the supernatural, the material and the spiritual. Oriental mysticism illustrates this. A dualism existed. At times this dualism resolved itself into a monism wherein the natural and the material were regarded as non-existent. "From at least the time of Zoroaster there has been in the thought of Central Asia that strain of metaphysical and moral dualism of which a thousand years later Manichaeism is the fully developed expression." Streeter - The Buddha and the Christ, p.48.

the East, and if it did not influence Plato and through him find its way into Christian mysticism, it found an admirer in one of the Christian followers of Plato, St. Augustine, who introduced it into Christianity. According to its teachings, the world and human flesh were regarded as evil. God could be found only in the world beyond. World denial and flight formed the only pathway to God. Plotinus worked this conception out fully in his mystic way, the "Via Negativa." Strictly speaking, Plotinus should not be classified under Christian mysticism. He was not a Christian, yet Christian mysticism owes much to him. Plato was the philosophical parent. Plotinus was the mystic father of Ascetic mysticism. He adapted Neo Platonism to mystical usage, formulated the mystical conceptions and the mystic way, which were used by Ascetic mysticism. Plotinus revolted from the cold rationalism of the later Platonic schools. His was a rationalism crowned with mysticism. The theory of emanations is central in the thought of Plotinus. Everything emanated from God and returned to God. The last step in this return was not rational but mystical; it was ecstasy.

The most outstanding of the early Christian Ascetic mystics were St. Augustine and his successors, St. Gregory and St. Bernard—all pre-scholastic. They owed much to Plato for their philosophical conceptions, and their mysticism follows that of Plotinus, with additional Christian characteristics. Next to Plato and Plotinus, Proclus and Dionysius are the most outstanding of the non-Christian thinkers who influenced Mediaeval Ascetic mysticism. Their conceptions found their way into Christianity during the 9th century, through the translations by John Scotus Erigena of pseudo-Dionysius. The thought is Neo Platonic tinged with Oriental semi-panteism. Deification came into

-
1. Plotinus was an Alexandrian Neo-Platonist.
 2. The tradition is untrue that Dionysius was a convert of Paul and wrote the Dionysian writings. These are attributed to an almost unknown person known as pseudo-Dionysius who wrote in Christian circles about the 5th century, phrasing the Neo-Platonism of Dionysius in Christian language. This came down to him through Hierotheus.

prominence now.

The Victorine School— Bernard, Richard and Hugh — in the first half of the twelfth century, marked a new outburst of mysticism. This was evangelical in type. The rational element was much subdued, yet present; the dualism of the natural and the supernatural, begun by Plato, was still in evidence. Deification was a central doctrine. Union or fellowship with God was not won, but was a gift of Divine grace. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, St. Francis heralded a new era in mysticism. He was the morning star of the Renaissance and Reformation. Although an Ascetic mystic, he anticipated the mysticism of the Humanist, which came with the Renaissance. For him, all living creatures, both man and beast, were dear and beloved in God; they were a "theophany or appearance of God."¹

²
Eckhart, the greatest of the speculative mystics, furthered this tendency. Though influenced by the writings of pseudo-Dionysius with its theory of immanence and its long ladder of ascent to God, Eckhart abandoned these central positions for another. He held to a theory of immanence, God in the ground of the soul. He therefore abandoned the conventional long ladder of ascent of the mystic way. He broke with the monkish ideal, with its dualism and withdrawal from the world and outward occupations. He saw no contradiction between the contemplative and active life, which his predecessors had noted.

"Martha hath chosen the good part, that is, he says, she is striving to be as holy as her sister. Mary is still at school. Martha has learnt her lesson. It is better to feed the hungry, than to see even such visions as St. Paul saw."³

1. Underhill - op. cit. p.312.

2. Inge - op. cit. p.148.

3. " " " p. 61.

Eckhart's successors, Ruysbroeck, Suso, Tauler and the writer of the *Theologia Germanica*, were non-intellectual, practical mystics. Their mysticism was a religion of the heart. The great Italian mystics, St. Catherine of Siena and St. Catherine of Genoa, were of the same type, and likewise the counter Reformation of the Spanish mystics, St. Theresa and St. John of the Cross. They carried on the Catholic tradition of Mediaeval Europe.

With the discovery of America, the rediscovery of the classical worlds of Greece and Rome and the coming of the Renaissance and Reformation, the sun of Mediaeval Europe set, and ascetic mysticism came to its end. Since its philosophy had been dualistic and oft-times semi-pantheistic, one eye, the eye of sense, had to be closed before the spiritual eye, the eye of the soul, could behold God. The Renaissance and Reformation opened both eyes. The old dualistic philosophy was abandoned, and with it all which it had created — world renouncement, "the flight of the alone to the Alone," the "Via Negativa," or the mystic ladder with its purgation, contemplation and union. Now, for the Humanist, nature, the material world, was symbolic of, a stepping-stone to the Divine. He gazed now with both eyes opened. He saw God in all things and all things in God.

Boehme, a child of the Reformation, was one of its most noted mystics¹ and philosophers. He has been called "the father of Protestant mysticism." He marks the transition from the purely subjective type of mysticism to that of symbolism. Germany felt his influence most. In England he influenced the seventeenth century mystic, William Law, and also the poet, Blake. During the seventeenth century England was rich in mysticism. It produced George Fox and I. Inge - op. cit. p.278.

the Quakers with their corporate type of mysticism. The Cambridge Platonists belong to this period. Finally the nature mystic poets ought to be mentioned, Vaughan and Traherne in the seventeenth century, and Wordsworth in the eighteenth.

2. Mysticism - Ascetic.

a. Aim.

The mystic of every age had a vision of Perfection; he had seen the Perfect, and he wanted to be perfect too. It was the call of Deep unto deep, the heart's quest for fellowship and life with God. The Ascetic mystic's dualistic philosophy raised barriers which had to be overcome before this quest could be realized. God was to be found only in the world beyond. This world was evil. A further barrier had to be faced with the introduction of the semi-panteistic ideas of pseudo-Dionysius. The world was not only evil but of an illusory character. These philosophical conceptions, therefore determined the mystic's method of attaining his goal - world denial and flight. These gave to the Mediaeval mystic the name, Ascetic.

b. Method.

The way proper is known as the "Via Negativa," first made popular by Plotinus and described by his famous phrase, "the flight of the alone to the Alone."

"We must stand alone in It and must become It alone after stripping off all the rest that hangs about us... There we can behold both Him and our own selves, - ourselves full of intellectual light, or rather as Pure Light. Itself, having become God, or rather as being simply He....abiding altogether unmoved, having become as it were Stability Itself...When man has moved out of himself away to God, like the image to its Prototype, he has reached his journey's end..And this is the life of the Gods and of divine and blessed men...a flight of the alone to the Alone." ¹

1. Enneads VI book 9 and 11. Von Hugel-The Mystical Element of Religion, Vol.II, p.323.

The barrier between the mystic and his God was both ethical and intellectual; therefore this mystic way was both an ethical method of purification and an intellectual method of abstraction. This "Via Negativa" has been called the mystic ladder of ascent, and had three stages — purgation, contemplation and union. The initial step, purgation, consisted of, negatively, a denial of the world and of self, positively, self-surrender to God. Oft-times it was characterized by extreme asceticism. Suso suffered seventeen years of such. St. Catherine of Genoa served a penitential period of four years. In these days asceticism seems obnoxious, yet behind it there is a profound spiritual meaning. It symbolized that there was an element of real wrongness in the world which should not be ignored nor evaded, but squarely met. In these days we do not meet the problem ⁱⁿ ^{manner} /this/. Our metaphysics differ. Both the Oriental and Ascetic mystic pointed to matter and self as the root of the problem. To the former, being a semi-pantheist, these were of an illusory character; to the latter, being a dualist, they were evil. With such philosophies, they had no choice but to act as they did.

In the second stage of the "Via Negative," contemplation, the mystic left behind the phenomenal world. His face was turned heavenward, and his whole being was concentrated upon God.

"When we are thus introverted and warmly penetrated throughout with a living sense of the Divine Presence; when the senses are all recollected and withdrawn from the circumference to the centre, and the soul is sweetly and silently employed on the truths we have read, not in reasoning, but in feeling thereon, and in animating the will by affection, rather than fatiguing the understanding by study, when, I say the affections are in this state..we must allow them sweetly to repose and peacefully to drink in that of which they have tasted." ¹

1. Mme. Guyon - A Short and Easy Method of Prayer.

Contemplation consisted of several minor stages — recollection, quiet, and introversion. The final and crowning stage of the "Via Negativa" was union. Eckhart in the 13th century abandoned the mystic way. His conception of the Divine spark in the soul did not require it. This spark was the true "Wesen" of the soul, akin to God, one with Him, into which all its faculties could be transformed. Later mysticism of the Humanist type followed Eckhart in this. Tauler called this Divine spark the "ground", the German mystics "Funklein," the Quakers "Inward Light." Like the Sufi mystic, the method of the Ascetic mystic can be summed up in one word, love.

"The two spirits" says John of Ruysbroeck, "our spirit and the spirit of God, yearn for each other in love. Each demands of the other all, that it is, and invites to all that it is. These two, God's grasp and His gift, our craving and our giving back, these fulfil love."

c. Goal.

Union was the last rung in the mystic ladder, the goal of the "Via Negativa." The Western mystics, St. Augustine, St. Gregory and St. Bernard, among the finest examples of the Mediaeval mystics, describe this experience as a "spiritual marriage."² Though primarily religious and mystical, their Neo Platonic thinking influenced their thought of union. In this experience the world was left behind. They mounted up to the spiritual realm where they met God. Being creatures of this world, they must return. The experience was therefore transient.

"Little by little we passed beyond all temporal things - beyond the heaven itself whence sun, moon, and stars shine down upon the earth. Aye, further still we soared in this spiritual contemplation and discourse and wonder of Thy works, till we

1. Paterson - The Nature of Religion, p.282.

2. Butler - Western Mysticism, p.161.

"came to our very selves; and beyond them we passed to reach that region of unfailing plenty where with the food of truth Thou feedest Israel forever, and where life is, that Wisdom by Whom all these things are made..And while we thus spake and yearned for her, we slightly touched her with the whole efforts of our hearts; and we sighed and there left bound the first fruits of the Spirit, and then came back again to the sound of our own voices where words uttered have both beginning and end." ¹

After the Western Mystics, the semi-panteism of pseudo-Dionysius appeared in Ascetic mysticism, and with it, deification and absorption.

"...All things are gathered together in one in the Divine sweetness and the man's being is so penetrated with the Divine substance that he loses himself therein as a drop of water is lost in a cask of strong wine and thus the man's spirit is so sunk in God, in divine union, that he loses all sense of distinction..." ²

Tauler, Sermon for Septuagesima Sunday.

Though they found expression, these semi-panteistic tendencies were kept in check by the religious and mystical urge. The unitive life was not always absorption and deification, but life in God.

."Thus this man is just, and he goes towards God by inward love, in eternal worth, and he goes in God by his fruitive inclination in eternal rest. And he dwells in God; and yet he goes out towards created things, in a spirit of love towards all things, in the virtues and in works of righteousness. And this is the supreme summit of the inner life." ³

d. Ethic.

Purgation, the first stage of the "Via Negativa", was mainly an ethical purification from sin. It was also an intellectual process. Behind ascetic mysticism, there was a Neo Platonic dualism which was concerned with the

¹. Confessions of St. Augustine - Kirk - op. cit. p.323.

². Winkworth - The History and Life of the Rev. Doctor John Tauler.

³. Ruysbroeck, L'Ornement des Meies Spirituelles, Underhill -op.cit. p.522.

metaphysical problem of evil in the world and self. Especially with the extreme philosophical mystics, this tended to push into the background the ethical problem of sin and Christian salvation won through Christ. This was not the case with the more religious mystics, such as the Victorine School. The contemplative and unitive stages of the mystic way have been criticised because of their individualistic character. Here, the mystic has been charged with neglect of his fellowmen in his zeal for God. The fault lies not with his mysticism, but ^{with} his philosophy which taught the evil of the human self and of the world and made love for man an afterthought. "The Gospel story of Martha and Mary shows that the contemplative life is in itself to be preferred; Mary chose the better part..." St. Bernard Sermon de div. IX, 4. Eckhart in the thirteenth century and after him, the Renaissance, made obsolete the "Via Negativa" and its monkish ideal of contemplation with its neglect of love for one's fellowmen. Ruysbroeck, a disciple of Eckhart, could write, "The Spirit of God Himself pushes us out from Himself..in order that we may love and do good works."

3. Mysticism - Humanist.

a. Aim and Method.

The Mysticism of the Humanist had as its philosophical background, not the dualism of Plato and its creations, world flight and the "Via Negativa". It borrowed from that other phase of Plato's thought which saw the material world as a symbol of the spiritual, not a hindrance but a stepping-stone to God.

"God made the universe and all the creatures contained therein as so many glasses wherein He might reflect His own glory. He hath copied forth Himself in the creation; and in this outward world we may

1. Butler - Western Mysticism, p.246.

2. Underhill - op. cit. p.422.

"read the lovely characters of the Divine goodness, power and wisdom... ." 1

Eckhart, heralding the Renaissance, dealt a death blow to Ascetic mysticism, with his philosophical conception of immanence and his belief in the divine "spark of the soul." It was a more metaphysical expression of the religious truth that man was divine, made in the image of God, with the spirit of God in him. The Quakers called this "spark" the "Inward Light"; Boehme and Law, the "Divine Spark."

"If" says Boehme, "thou conceivest a small minute circle, as small as a grain of mustard seed, yet the Very Heart of God is wholly and perfectly therein; and if thou art born in God, then there is in thyself (in the circle of thy life) the whole heart of God undivided." 2

Gifted with this "spark of the soul", a man beholds God in all things.

b. Goal and Ethics.

The Humanist's vision of God was a discovery of the Perfect One ab-laze in the many, God in His world, and especially the God of Christ.

"Great things did the Lord lead me into, and wonderful depths were opened unto me, beyond what can by words be declared; but as the people come into sub-jection to the Spirit of God, and grow up in the image and power of the Almighty, they can receive the word of wisdom that opens all things and come to know the hid-den unity in the Eternal Being." 3

As is evident in the above quotation, most of these mystics were the offspring of Plato, and in their experience of union, the Deity was oft-times a philosophical Reality as well as a Christian God. This is especially true of Boehme. Faced/^{with} the question of ethics, the Humanist was not led to err, as was his older brother, the Ascetic mystic. The world was a divine theophany; man and beast

1. John Smith, Cambridge Platonist, Inge - op. cit. p.294.

2. The Threefold Life of Man, Chap. VI, 71 Underhill - op. cit. p.120-121.

3. Fox, "Journal" Vol.I. i. Chap ii. Underhill - op. cit. p.309.

were a revelation of God. Love for man was vitally connected with love for God.

4. Summary.

Plato was the philosophic father of the two types of Christian mysticism, Ascetic and Humanist. The Renaissance and Reformation mark the dividing line between them. The philosophy of the former was dualistic. This accounts for those unattractive phases of Ascetic mysticism which are condemned in our day — world denial, "the flight of the alone to the Alone," the "Via Negativa," asceticism/^{and} love for God the supreme passion even to the neglect of love for man. The influence of the semi-panteistic philosophy of pseudo-Dionysius was responsible for trances, absorption, and deification. All these were the logical outcome of the mystic's philosophy, and not his mysticism. These were foreign to the Humanist. He, too, was indebted to Plato for the philosophical setting of his mysticism. The world was a symbol of the Divine. Life was a sacrament. Finally the writer desires to emphasize this. The Christian mystic was primarily religious; he sought fellowship or union with God. He was also a child of his age, and accepted the philosophy of his day and generation. Before the Renaissance he was a dualist, after it, a symbolist. These conceptions coloured his thought of God, and governed the manner in which he reached the goal of his quest.

E. Prophetic Mysticism.

1. History and Teaching.

The term, prophetic mysticism, has been taken from the unpublished Gifford Lectures of 1930-31 "Basal Forms of Personal Religion", by the late Archbishop Nathan Soderblom. Our inquiry thus far, with its insistence upon a

broad definition of mysticism, anticipates the use of this term, Prophetic mysticism. Prophecy took its rise in Israel in the eighth century B.C., and continued for four centuries. The English word, prophet, is the equivalent of two Hebrew roots ¹רָאָה (ro eh) - seer and נָבִיא (nabi)-speaker, for God. The former root describes the prophet in his relation to God—preceiving or receiving God's truth. The latter deals with his relations with man—one who spoke the word of God. Prophecy had two causes. It owed its origin to the Hebrew belief that God makes His will known and desires for men communion with Himself. This is common to all mankind, and here religion and mysticism take their rise. Prophecy also owed its origin to the fact that the Hebrew heart shrank from hearing the voice of God directly. There was need of a mediator, and the prophet fulfilled this function.

The Hebrew was no metaphysician. He never speculated as to whether God existed or not, or what was His essence. Only in the later writers of the Old Testament is this found at all. For the Hebrew, the world does not suggest an idea hitherto strange, that of the existence of God. The thought of the writers is never of the nature of a search after God, who is not known, but always of the nature of a recognition and observation of God, whom they already knew.

"The Hebrew writer however came down from his thought of God upon the world; he did not rise from the world up to his thought of God...His primary thought of God explained to him the world, both its existence and the course of events upon it; these did not suggest to him either the existence or character of God, these being unknown to him." ²

The Hebrew does not come to a knowledge of God by reflection upon nature/

1. Jer. 26:15.

2. Davidson - The Theology of the Old Testament, p.32-33.

nature and history. His knowledge of God explains these. All through the Old Testament the knowability of God is assumed. This is brought out clearly in the creation story of the second chapter of Genesis. Man is God's creation, made like Himself, capable of fellowship with God. This is God's doing. Through this relationship, God makes Himself known. His character is such that He must reveal Himself. The initiative is with God. It is for man to hearken and obey. The call of Abraham¹ especially illustrates this. Man is of his very nature capable of receiving a revelation from God. God likewise must reveal Himself to man. And what matters is how man reacts to that revelation. The Old Testament begins and ends in something intensely personal. God is a personality, a historical being with a moral character, righteous and loving, a just God, and yet a redeemer.² Since this was His character, He must make Himself known, and the vehicles of His revelation are nature, the human soul, and especially history.

These ideas of God and of revelation dominate all Old Testament thinking and are closely related to one another. Since God has a moral personality it implies that He has a moral will and purpose to reveal. This implies a divine plan and revelation.³ Professor Bevan maintains that this is the distinctive mark in the Hebraic world view as compared with the Greek. With the latter, God is an immovable Being who performs no particular acts in the time process. The world process is purposeless, a circular movement leading nowhere. Deliverance is won by the individual when he detaches himself in soul from the world. The Hebraic world view starts with a God whose character is moral and will, righteous. He is one who reveals His character and fulfills His will in definite/

1. Gen. 12.

2. Robinson - Religious Ideas of the Old Testament, p.70.

3. E. Bevan and C. Singer - Legacy of Israel, p.50 and p.195. See also Streeter - op. cit. p. 45-46.

definite mighty acts in the world process. History embodies a Divine plan beginning in God's mighty act at creation and leading up to a great consummation in the future. Associated with the Divine plan, there is a Divine community, chosen to be the vehicle of God's redemptive purpose and sharers in the consummation.

Yahweh had revealed Himself as a God of redemption, especially to Israel. He had loved her,¹ chosen² and brought her into being at the Exodus.³ He loved her with an unchanging love; though she erred, He ever had compassion.⁴ Yahweh's creation and election of Israel were recognized by the latter in the covenant at Sinai.⁵ The righteous Yahweh loveth righteousness; therefore according to the covenant, Israel must be holy, consecrated to Yahweh. This covenant relation was for a purpose. There was a goal set before Israel, a kingdom of God, a Theocracy. With the prophets, this theocracy not only included Israel but all the nations; it became universal.

The prophet was God's representative in His dealings with Israel. From the time of Jeremiah onward, the individualistic note appears in God's dealings with man. As suggested by the creation narratives, God has fellowship with man for His own sake.⁶ The Psalms and the literature of the late Persian and Greek periods illustrate this. Before Jeremiah's day, God had revealed Himself to the nation, through the prophets. They are the bearers of the revelation. Strictly speaking, there was no prophetic office with well-defined functions like the priesthood of Israel. The prophet was simply a man called and commissioned by God, God's mouth-piece.⁷ Scholarship in past days depicted the

prophets as preachers of a noble ethical monotheism, brave and sagacious guides

1. Is. 43-44.

2. Is. 41:8.

3. Ex. 20:2; Is. 48:20.

4. Ex. 34:6.

5. Ex. 34:27.

6. Especially Ps. 73:25; 91:14.

7. Jer. 18:18.

of their people in political and international affairs, superstatesmen.¹ This is only part of the story.² They were more than mere politicians and ethical teachers. Yahweh had made Himself known to the prophets, His character, mind and will, His righteousness and holiness. Since He was thus and had dealt thus with Israel and the nations, He demanded such in return. The prophets saw that this was not forthcoming, therefore Yahweh was about to act and destroy Israel. Assyria and Babylonia were His instruments. The prophets were therefore the heralds of the great and terrible Day of Adoni, which they declared to be immanent upon all peoples.

2. Mysticism.

a. Aim.

The prophet was not a philosopher; his problems were religious and ethical, not intellectual. The existence of God was axiomatic, and God explained the prophets' world and himself. There were no metaphysical barriers existing between God and man, which had to be transcended, as found in Oriental or Mediaeval mysticism. There were not even ethical barriers. The Hebrew had a strong sense of sin, and yet this did not interfere with his knowing God. Man knows God,³ for God makes Himself known and reveals His will. Man is so constituted that he seeks fellowship with God. He goes contrary to his nature if he does otherwise. The prophet therefore sought communion with God, to know His will and to be the vehicle whereby His mind might be revealed to the nation.

b. Method.

Since there were no barriers between the prophet and God, there was no "flight of the alone to the Alone," no ascent to God. On the contrary, the prophet thought of God as descending to man. He came down into the world process in

1. Micklem - Prophecy and Eschatology, p.240.

2. Welch - The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom, p75.

3. Ps. 46:10; Hos. 5:4. The writer is indebted mainly to A.B. Davidson and Adam Welch for help regarding the prophets. For a more detailed account, refer to Appendix D.

mighty redemptive acts. Again and again, He descended to the prophets to reveal His will and purpose for the nation. They were called, set apart, mouth-pieces of Yahweh. The manner of the call varied.¹ Today, / ^{because} of the influence of psychology, it is the fashion to regard the prophets as ecstasies. This view has been maintained by Holscher in Germany, and made popular by T.H. Robinson² in this country. The question is a large and difficult one. The earlier prophets may have been influenced by the primitive "nebi'im" of Israel, and even Ezekiel may have bordered on ecstasy at times, but this is not found in the great literary prophets. This is especially true of Jeremiah. During the theophany,³ the mind of the prophet was not a blank. It was not passive, but in a state of intense activity. The prophet was supremely conscious of the character of his God and the unethical character of the nation. This was the crowning fact of the prophet's experience. A.B. Davidson⁴ describes this as "perceiving truth by intuition." The whole experience was one of intense emotion, and unlike ecstasy, there was no cessation of the mind and no loss of consciousness. Further, it is to be noted that the literary prophets made no direct reference to the Spirit when they described this experience. Their predecessors had associated the Spirit too often with abnormal emotion and ecstasy. In deliberately omitting to mention the Spirit, they dissociated themselves from all this. In the light of these facts, it is impossible to call the prophet an ecstatic.

"...the inspiration of the great prophets had nothing in common with the ecstasy of the prophets of the older type...nor are the visions of the literary prophets in any way akin to the ecstatic visions and dreams of the diviner."⁵

1. Is. 6; Jer. 1:5-10.

2. Robinson - Prophecy and the Prophets, p.50.

3&4. Davidson - Prophecy and the Prophets, H.D.B. Vol.IV, p.116.

5. Butteswieser - The Prophets of Israel, p.138, quoted by Micklem -op.cit.p.44.

The prophets were not ecstasies, but pre-eminently men of faith. Faith or trust was the basic element in Hebrew and Jewish piety,¹ and the religion of the prophets was one of faith or trust. Yahweh was moral and not capricious as the nature deities of the other nations. Because^{of this} moral character, His dealings with the nation were ever the same. Past history testified to the righteousness of His ways, and more, it revealed His graciousness towards Israel. The future would reveal His moral purpose for the nation and the world. Oft-times the reading of history seemed to deny this, yet they trusted in Him. They believed that He would vindicate His character and fulfil His Divine plan for Israel and mankind.² The prophets therefore called upon the nation to live with God in a spiritual fellowship of faith. Certain metaphors³ are associated with the words, faith or trust, and illustrate the richness and variety of the content of these words. Waiting or looking for Yahweh not infrequently implied the idea of trusting in Him.⁴ Trusting in Yahweh is sometimes spoken of figuratively as leaning upon Him.⁵ Oft-times Yahweh is looked upon as a stronghold or a place of refuge for those who trust in Him.⁶ Finally there is the thought of cleaving or clinging to God.⁷ From the time of Jeremiah on, not only the nation but the individual was privileged to enjoy this fellowship with Yahweh of faith or trust.⁸

c. Goal.

Jeremiah is completely free from the abnormalities of the lesser prophets, and enjoys a conscious and normal experience of fellowship with God of faith or trust.⁹ All his thoughts are coloured by this religious relationship

1. Hatch - op. cit. p.82.

2. Is.7:9; 28:16.

3. See Hatch - op. cit. p.7-10.

4. Is.8:16; Mic. 7:7.

5. Mic. 3:11; Is. 50:10.

6. Zep. 3:12; Nah. 1:7. 7. Deut. 10:20.

8. Ps. 73:23; 26.

9. Peake - The People and the Book. W.H. Robinson - Hebrew Psychology, p.373.

to God which is his.¹ With Jeremiah the personal note enters into the religion of Israel. God has written His law upon the inward parts and the heart of man.² He knows, has seen, and has tried the heart of Jeremiah.³ This relationship or fellowship is a gift of God. Before Jeremiah's time, only the nation had received this from God's hands.⁴ Now this favour was extended to the individual.⁵

Through this relationship or fellowship, the prophet came to know God. His character, His mind and will, was revealed as moral. He was righteous and just, and He was more. The knowledge which the prophet shared was especially that of God's forgiveness.⁶ This was the most wonderful of all the Divine characteristics. Because of the character of God and especially His graciousness and forgiveness, the prophet's relationship to God was moral. ^{In manner,} /this/ religion and morality were wedded together; "what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God."⁷

"What Scripture (i.e.O.T.) means by the knowledge of God is an ethical relation to Him; and on the other side, when it says that God knows man, it means He has sympathy and fellowship with him. All Israel's history is filled with this reciprocal knowledge."⁸

d. Message and Ethic.

The burden of the prophet's message sprang from his knowledge of the mind and will of Yahweh attained through this fellowship of faith or trust. God had created this relationship and had drawn near by means of it, revealing His righteous character and moral will. The prophet was His mouthpiece, chosen to

1. Davidson-Jeremiah, H.D.B. Vol.II, p.576.

2. Jer. 31:33-34.

3. Jer. 12 :3.

4. Hos. 6:6; 4:1. 5. Jer. 31:33-34.

6. Hos. 2:19-20; Jer. 9:24.

7. Mic. 6:8.

8. Davidson - Old Testament Theology, p.78.

1
speak to the nation concerning these; therefore he could do nought else but
prophecy. His message was concerned with a righteous God and ^{an}unrighteous
that of
nation. Unlike the prophets, the religion of the nation was not moral. Morality had been forgotten. Yahweh, the God of the prophets, was a moral God. Since God was moral, religion, what man offered God, must be moral also, after the pattern of God. God in His dealings was their example and prototype. Because of the unrighteousness of the nation, the prophet also proclaimed punishment, doom, the terrible day of the Lord. ²Beyond this there was the promise of a brighter and better day. The prophets had faith in Yahweh and a passionate confidence in the victory of His righteousness and the overthrow of evil. They therefore looked for a future and final consummation, when the eternal principles of Divine righteousness would be established and God would ³rule forever.

3. Summary.

Prophecy marked the high-water point of Israel's religion. The prophet was no metaphysician. His interest was primarily religious. He sought and found an intimate fellowship with God of faith or trust. No barriers stood in his way. God created this fellowship; it was His gift. The prophet's God was personal, having a character which was moral. This made the prophet's faith relationship with God a moral relationship, and united his religion with his morality. Further, since God's character was moral, this implied a will and purpose which was moral, righteous, and loving. From this the prophetic conception of revelation sprang. God had stepped into the sphere of history in

1. Amos 7:5; Jer. 1:7; Is. 6:8.

2. Is. 2:12.

3. Is. 11:1.

creation and in certain mighty acts of redemption. Through fellowship, God revealed further to the prophet, His righteous character and Divine will and purpose to establish righteousness on earth. The prophets were men of faith. They believed in the righteousness of their God, and trusted that His will and purpose would ultimately triumph. Therefore they went to the nation, proclaiming God as a God of righteousness and the nation as unrighteous. They foretold the terrible day of the Lord and the final consummation. Jeremiah, the greatest of the prophets, with his intimate moral faith relationship with God, is the finest illustration of Prophetic mysticism.

II. DEFINITION

A. Classification and Definition.

To the reader, this historical survey may seem to have been lengthy and needless. To the writer, there was no other course, if he was to present and define mysticism as he understands it, and also answer its critics. Throughout this survey, the aim of the writer has been to bring out the two aspects of mysticism—the primary, the religious or mystical, that of the heart's creation; and the secondary, the philosophical, that of the mind. The mystic of every age sought and found fellowship and union with the Deity. His philosophy determined greatly the manner of attainment and the character of that fellowship. The world denial and flight of the Oriental was the result of his pessimistic and semi-pantheistic philosophy. Further, when his philosophy dominated his religion, the reality of the world, the human self and the personality of the Deity were in danger of being sacrificed in the cause of philosophical unity.

Christian mysticism, both Ascetic and Humanist, was also influenced by the philosophies of the day. Before the Renaissance, the philosophical dualism and semi-panteism of the Ascetic mystic were responsible for the mystic way, the "Via Negativa," and its accessories, absorption and deification. After the Renaissance, the philosophy of the Humanist became an aid rather than a hindrance in his fellowship with God. Prophetic mysticism was primarily religious. No philosophy erected barriers or coloured the prophet's thought of God. He enjoyed an intimate faith fellowship with God.

1&2

Certain critics have regarded mysticism as a type of philosophy - panteism in its many forms. This criticism will be dealt with more fully later. At this juncture, the writer wishes only to state again that he regards mysticism, not as a philosophy, but religion in its most intense form. Since mysticism was ever a child of its age, Oriental mysticism was semi-panteistic in its philosophical thinking; Ascetic Christian mysticism, dualistic. Prophetic mysticism was primarily religious. Mysticism is not a philosophy or one type of philosophy. History does not testify to the ebb and flow of the interest in mysticism, simultaneous with that of philosophy or any one type of philosophy. A glance at Sufism or the mysticism of the Victorine School proves this. Sufism became predominantly philosophical in the later stages of its development. Then it was less mystical. The Victorines were more passionately mystical than their contemporaries and less philosophical and panteistic.

Mysticism is not a philosophy. On the contrary, in history it has

3&4

even been characterized by a revolt from the tyranny of extreme forms of philosophy/

1. Oman-The Natural and the Supernatural, p.495.
2. Holmes - The Mystic as Explorer - Hibb. Jour. Vol.XXVI, p.433.
3. Hocking - Types of Philosophy, p.388.
4. Otto - The Idea of the Holy, p.vii.

philosophy and their offshoots — rationalism, agnosticism, and materialism. Then the heart of man rebelled against servitude to the intellect of man. This revolt often developed into a form of anti-rationalism, so extreme that it ended in pure feeling. Plotinus and his followers rebelled against the cold Greek rationalism of their day, the Victorines and St. Francis against the barren dialectic of the Christian Church, the Practical mystics of the thirteenth century against the unfeeling scholasticism of those times. After the Reformation, the German mystics turned from the over-intellectual theology and doctrines of the Protestant Church; Schliermacher^e and the Romantics from Kant and the German idealists; Fox and the Quakers from the institutionalism of the Anglican Church in the seventeenth century; Wesley and his followers from the deism of England in the eighteenth century. Today a man like Eddington typifies the swing which is taking place in science from scepticism and dogmatism to religion and even mysticism. Further, there is a new interest in mysticism today — Inge, Underhill, Von Hugel, Jones; each one is protesting against the modern tyranny of the intellect. Individual mystics as well as movements within mysticism, illustrate one of the most outstanding marks of mysticism, the revolt of the heart against enslavement by the intellect. Wordsworth's nature mysticism was a reaction from the rationalism of Godwin and the French revolutionary doctrines which he had earlier held. The story of mysticism in history and this characteristic of mysticism, its protest against the supremacy of the intellect, proves conclusively that mysticism takes its rise not in the intellect of man but in man's whole personality.

It is difficult to define mysticism. Like religion itself, it finds expression in many forms. Ruskin somewhere has pointed out the difficulty of pronouncing whether or not certain buildings are truly Gothic in their architecture. He claimed that all he could reason upon is a greater or less degree of Gothicism in each building. Pointed arches alone do not constitute Gothicism, nor vaulted roofs, flying buttresses, grotesque sculpture, but all or some of these things and many other things with them, when they all are brought together to form a unity and have life. It is the spirit behind these which ultimately constitute^s Gothic architecture; these are but the manifestations of that spirit. Mysticism is similar. There are many forms and expressions, but the one passion and spirit run through all. The God-intoxicated Hindu and the Buddhist holy man anticipate religiously the Old Testament prophet and the Christian mystic. They are brothers in that they seek fellowship with the Divine. Fellowship with the Divine¹ is the common characteristic of all mysticism in its lowest as well as its highest forms. Man is so constituted that he is capable of fellowship with God. When he seeks to establish a personal relationship between himself and his Maker, he is acting in accordance with his own being. He is fulfilling the purpose for which he was created, namely, fellowship with God.

Primitive religions lack this characteristic for they have not yet reached this level of religious development. They are concerned with ceremonies, rites and sacrifices. With the aid of these the worshipper desires to appease and win the favour of the deity. This being accomplished, the act

1. See Appendix E for a fuller statement of the writer's views regarding "fellowship with the Divine."

of worship ceases. The mystic, on the contrary, seeks to establish a personal fellowship with God. No ulterior motive impels him, but rather the highest longings of his own nature for communion with God. In primitive religions, this yearning for fellowship is latent but as yet not expressed. When it finds expression, then that religion becomes mystical.

"When the desire of man for communion with the Divine reaches a certain stage of intensity and passion, ¹ then you have the beginnings of religious mysticism."

This fellowship, which is of the very nature of mysticism, varies in the different branches of mysticism. A primitive type of mysticism exhibits a low form of fellowship; a more advanced type, a higher form. Oriental mysticism illustrates this. The Hindu and Buddhist mystics had not attained a high conception of deity. They did not think of God in terms of personality, and their gods therefore were not worthy of and did not demand the surrender of their whole personality. The relationship also which was established between them and their deities, though it could be called a personal fellowship, was therefore of a lower type. Allah, the god of the mystics of Islam, was personal in character, sharing some of the attributes of the God of the prophets and of Christianity. The Sufi mystic consequently enjoyed a fellowship with Allah which was of a higher personal character. Prophetic and Christian mysticism exemplify this mystical fellowship/

1. Jones - Studies in Mystical Religion, p.6.

fellowship at its best. In these religions, the religious conception of the personality of God had reached its highest level. The prophet looked upon God as just and righteous (the prophet Hosea, as loving). The Christian mystic thought of God in terms of Jesus Christ. God was holy love. He required of them the allegiance of their whole personality. He demanded a surrender of and called forth from them the best within. Their fellowship or relationship with God was consequently of a very high character, a fellowship which was extremely personal, intimate, and passionate. This is mysticism in its finest form. If mysticism can be defined, Rufus Jones, in the opinion of the writer, has expressed it best.

"I shall use the word, mysticism, to express the type of religion which puts emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God, on direct and intimate consciousness of the Divine Presence. It is religion in its most acute, intense and living stage."¹

B. The Critics of Mysticism.

The most outstanding of the critics of mysticism are Ritschl, Harnack, Lehmann, Heiler and Oman. Ritschl attacked especially Ascetic mysticism, claiming that it was neither Christian nor Protestant.² The mystic needed not the atoning death of Christ. He left Christ and history

1. Jones - op. cit. p.xv. Rufus Jones' position is outlined more fully in Appendix F.

2. Ritschl - The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, pp. 112-113.

behind in his flight to God, seeking deification¹ and annihilation. He was, therefore, not a Christian but a Neo Platonist.² Harnack carried further the criticism of his master. Mysticism owed its origin to Neo-Platonism and especially to pseudo-Dionysius.³ The mystic was an individualist, stressing feeling and pantheistic metaphysic, and neglecting history and the death of Christ. This was Catholic piety in general. The mystic who does not become a Catholic is a dilettante.⁴ Lehmann, after a survey of Oriental and Christian mysticism, notes the common characteristics — asceticism,⁵ feeling,⁶ absorption,⁷ and annihilation. Herrmann describes mysticism as subjective, individualistic, emotional, neglecting history and Christ.

"When the influence of God upon the soul is sought and found solely in an inward experience of the individual, when certain excitements of the emotions are taken, with no further question, as evidence that the soul is possessed by God; when, at the same time, nothing external to the soul is consciously and clearly perceived and firmly grasped; when no thoughts that elevate the spiritual life are aroused by the positive contents of an idea that rules the soul — then that is the piety of mysticism. He who seeks in this wise, that, for the sake of which he is ready to abandon all besides, has stepped beyond the pale of Christian piety. He leaves Christ and Christ's Kingdom altogether behind him when he enters that sphere of experience which seems to be highest." ⁸

⁹ Heiler distinguishes between the two types of piety, the mystical and the prophetic. Mysticism negates personality, dispenses with history, flees from the world ^{and} seeks a life of contemplation. Prophecy affirms personality, ^{and} leans on history, transforms the world, ^{and} evangelizes. Oman carries further this

1. Ritschl - op. cit. p.99. 2. Ritschl - op. cit. p.497.
3. Harnack - History of Dogma, Vol.I, p.361. 4. Harnack - op. cit. p.98-100.
5. Lehmann - Mysticism in Heathendom and Christianity, p.11.
6. Lehmann - op. cit. p.8. 7. Lehmann - op. cit. p.11-12.
8. Herrmann - The Communion of the Christian with God, p.19-20.
9. Heiler - Das Gebet, p.283.

method of attack. There are two types of religion, the mystical and the Apocalyptic (prophetic). Both are determined by the way in which the natural (world) is regarded, either veiling or revealing the Supernatural. The mystic looks upon the world and human personality as unreal, illusion. The prophet finds in these "abiding meaning and endless purpose."¹ The mystic must flee from the illusion of the natural.² The prophet transforms the natural, and sees in it a revelation of the Supernatural.

"For the one, redemption is an absorption into the Supernatural - the sole reality, which is one, unchanging and eternal, and thereby it is an escape from the Natural - the great illusion, which is divided, fleeting and unsubstantial. For the other, redemption is by reconciliation to the meaning and purpose of the Supernatural, whereby the Natural is transformed and becomes both revelation and opportunity."

For Oman, mysticism is in its final analysis, pantheism. He finds its origin in India. Through Neo-Platonism and pseudo-Dionysius, it came into Christianity,^{4&5} and returned to the east in Sufism.

These criticisms are timely. The weaknesses of Christian mysticism especially have been pointed out and possibly overstated — subjective, individualistic, anti-social, neglecting the fact of sin, history and Christ, and fleeing from the world. These critics have failed to note that these shortcomings are the spurious elements of mysticism bequeathed to it by the philosophy of the day. Further, many of the mystics — St. Augustine, St. Francis, St. Theresa, Fox and others — have not been anti-social, but the greatest of churchmen and social reformers.

1. Oman - op. cit. p.405. 2. Oman - op. cit. p.411. 3. Oman - op. cit. p.407.

4. Oman - op. cit. p.419-420.

5. Oman - The Mystic as Explorer, Hibb. Jour. Vol. XXVI, p.451. Oman's own interpretation of prophecy is incorrect. According to him, the prophet rises from history and his interpretation of history to the Divine. History is the pathway to God. On the contrary the prophet came down from God to history and interpreted it in the light of his own experience and knowledge of God.

6. Royce - The World and the Individual, Vol. I, p.85.

If the Christian mystic neglected Christ, it was because he was over-occupied in bridging the metaphysical gulf between himself and God, created by his philosophy. Then he was too little of a mystic and too much of a philosopher. This cannot be said of the great mystics.

"Christian mysticism..is orientated at one and the same time towards the inaccessible God where all determination vanishes and towards the God, Logos...In spite of the sometimes contradictory appearance of absorption in the Father, it is, at bottom, the Mysticism of the Son."¹

Ritschl's severe attack upon mysticism may be explained as the result of his own bias in certain directions. Kant rooted religion in morality and the moral law. There was a complete absence of direct fellowship on the part of man with God. Ritschl inherited this tradition. He added to this conception of religion the historic Christ whom he regarded as the eternal value of God, who had approached men in time. Ritschl stressed the historic Christ, and neglected the indwelling, ever-present Lord. This explains his condemnation of the mystic's sometime neglect of history, and of his passion for mystic union with Christ. In regarding mysticism as a philosophy, both Ritschl and the other critics of mysticism have failed to recognize that asceticism, the mystic way, and other undesirable phases of mysticism were the spurious elements of mysticism, the product of the mystic's philosophy. They claim also that pantheism is the common thread which runs through all mysticism, both Oriental and Mediaeval. The preceding historical survey showed clearly that there were many periods in the history of mysticism when no trace of pantheism could be found. This is true especially of early Sufism and Western mysticism. It is yet to be proved

also that there is a common thread of pantheism linking all together. An

1. Translation from the French, Delacroix - Etudes sur le psychologie du mysticisme, p.xiii.

outstanding scholar of the Upanishads, Keith,¹ fails to see any literary connection. A leading authority on Sufism, Nicholson,² does not find the word, pantheism, descriptive of Sufism. These critics, defining mysticism as pantheistic, regard it as a philosophy. According to the writer, mysticism is not a philosophy. It is not of the mind of man, but of the heart, the whole personality of man.

Ernst Troeltsch,³ another outstanding critic of mysticism, attacked it from another angle. He divided religion into three types — the church, the sect, and the mystical. Mysticism was non-historical, formless, and purely individualistic. Troeltsch's criticisms are, in the main, sweeping generalizations. Like the critics named in the preceding page, he condemns the spurious elements bequeathed to the mystic by his philosophy.

Certain philosophers have contributed to the study and criticism of mysticism. Pringle Pattison⁴ notes two aspects of mysticism. It is religious and practical, and also philosophical, speculative and theoretical. It is akin to pantheism and yet primarily religious. The mystic by feeling seeks ineffable union. Then, "God ceases to be an object to him and becomes an experience."

Edward Caird⁵ regards Plotinus as the classic example of mysticism. All mystics desire to merge the consciousness of the world and of themselves in the consciousness of God. When they accomplish this, they arrive at their goal "with empty hands." For Royce,⁶ the Upanishads contain the entire story of the mystic

1. Keith - The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, pp.559-600.

2. Nicholson - The Idea of Personality in Sufism, p.52.

3. Troeltsch - The Social Teachings of the Christian Churches, p.743.

4. Pringle Pattison - Mysticism, Enc. Britt. 11th ed. p.123.

5. Caird - Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers, Vol.II, p.215.

6. Royce - The World and the Individual, Vol.I, p.170-175.

faith, so far as it has a philosophic basis. These philosophers regard mysticism as a type of philosophy, and criticise it as such. The historical survey has sought to show that mysticism is not a philosophy. Like religion itself, it needs a metaphysic, and borrows from its day and generation. It is these borrowings and the effects they have had upon mysticism which have come in for much criticism.

Of late, psychology has had a word to say about mysticism. William James¹ enumerates what he believes to be the characteristics of the mystic's experience—ineffability, noetic quality, transiency, passivity. The writer is of the opinion that these are the by-products of the union between the mystic's philosophy and his mysticism or religion. James also makes the unconscious the door through which the Divine enters the human. Others have explained mysticism away in terms of subjectivism—Coe,² auto-suggestion; Janet,³ hysteria; Leuba,⁴ inferiority complexes, ego and sex impulses. To prove their point, they have taken extreme cases of mysticism. In answer to their claims, it may be said that if subjectivism explains mysticism, it may also explain religion (Leuba maintains this), all knowledge, and even their own explanation.

C. The Exponents of Mysticism.

1. Historical.

Today there has been a new awakening of interest in mysticism. In England, Dean Inge⁵ and Evelyn Underhill⁶ have contributed valuable historical treatments, and Von Hugel,⁷ a learned biographical and psychological study of St. Catherine of Genoa. Inge's contribution is unsurpassed. He traces both

1. James - Varieties of Religious Experience.

2. Coe - The Psychology of Religion, p.273-4; Sources of Mystical Revelation, Hibb. Jour. Vol.VI, p.372.

3. Joly - The Psychology of the Saints, p.117.

4. Leuba - The Psychology of Religious Mysticism.

5. Inge - op. cit.

6. Underhill - Mysticism; The Mystic Way.

7. Von Hugel - The Mystical Element of Religion.

streams of mysticism, that of the Ascetic and Humanist, back to Plato. He errs in that he does not separate in a more pronounced way the mystic's religion from its philosophical background. Being a Platonist and philosopher as well as an exponent of mysticism, he fails to make this distinction. Further, he is apt to accept as the characteristics of mysticism all that philosophy has bequeathed to the mystic. He therefore chooses a narrow definition of mysticism, one which excludes Hebrew religion.¹ Evelyn Underhill is more guilty of this sin. The spurious elements of mysticism, the fruits of the mystic's philosophy, are the essential marks of mysticism — world negation, "the flight of the alone to the Alone," the mystic way. She even postulates a special mystical faculty.² In her treatment of Pauline mysticism, she fails to note the importance of faith, and attempts to fit the apostle into the framework of Mediaeval Ascetic mysticism.³

VonHugel's⁴ able biographical study of the Spanish mystic is also a valuable philosophical defence of mysticism. He points out its intensity, breadth and sanity, its relation to the manifold of life. Yet in choosing St. Catherine as an outstanding example, he has encountered that danger of limiting mysticism to the Mediaeval Ages and of defining it in terms of its spurious elements.

2. Philosophical.

In America, Rufus Jones, Charles Bennett, and Hocking have sought to make mysticism acceptable to the modern mind. Jones has done much of value in relating mysticism to religion, pointing out that "it is religion in its most

1. Inge - op. cit. p.39.

2. Underhill - Mysticism, p.59.

3. Underhill - The Mystic Way.

4. Von Hugel - op. cit.

acute and living stage,"¹ "it is the business of the whole self, it is the task of the entire man."² He has rendered a further service in examining the intuitive vision of the mystic³ and relating it to that of the scientist, poet, and mathematician, those in other realms of truth. In so doing, he has unified his world of thought, and shown how each seeker after truth in his own way reaches ultimately the same goal—Truth, Beauty and Goodness.

Bennett has made an able philosophical defence of mysticism. Further, he has pointed out what this survey of mysticism has attempted to do, namely, that mysticism is not primarily a philosophy, but like religion itself/^{it} is a way of life. The mystic and the philosopher walk their own paths, yet each eventually needs the company of the other.

"Wisdom," says Bennett, "lies not in choosing either mysticism or philosophy, but in choosing both. Philosophy is the articulation and completion of mysticism but mysticism in turn is needed in order to complete by correction and supplementation the work of philosophy. And this is a perpetual process. For it is the destiny of mysticism to lose its life in philosophy; it is the destiny of philosophy to recover its hold upon its object by renewal of the mystic vision...Reason may establish our certainties, it does not initiate them."⁴

Hocking likewise has defended mysticism philosophically. He accepts Otto's⁵ postulate of a "religious apriori" as the basis of all religion. Man has an experience of the "Numinous", a realizing sense of the Divine presence. Hocking⁶ begins here and develops this thought further. Religion is bound up in the difference between the sense of ignorance and the sense of mystery — the former, "I know not"; the latter, "I know not but it is known." The original

-
1. Jones - Studies in Mystical Religion, p. XV.
 2. Jones - op. cit. p. XII.
 3. Jones - Pathways to the Reality of God, p. 11, 155-157.
 4. Bennett - A Philosophical Study of Mysticism, p. 110.
 5. Otto - The Idea of the Holy.
 6. Hocking - The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p. 236-239.

source of knowledge of God may be described as an experience of "not being alone in knowing the world, especially the world of nature." Man begins with the premise, "I know not but it is known." This changes to "I know not but He knows." The Divine Knower is the necessity of all human knowledge. It is through an experience and knowledge of God that man can have an experience and knowledge of his world. Religion and mysticism are based, therefore, neither upon a hypothesis nor an inference, but an intuitional immediate experience of God. Hocking finds human friendship or love analogous to this experience. "What is the mystic's experience, but the finding of the idea of the whole as love finds the idea of a person."¹ Hocking's development of Otto's position has strengthened the latter greatly. Otto's numinous was too independent of the rational and moral. It was apt to be rooted in the feelings of man.

3. Summary.

The historical survey has shown that the Oriental, the Ascetic, the Humanist, and Prophetic mystics are all brothers. Within their hearts there burns an intense passionate desire for fellowship with God. Their differences are due to their philosophies. This is what the critics of mysticism fail to note. One and all criticise the mystics, but it is not their mysticism with which they find fault, but their philosophies and the manner in which these have influenced their mysticism. The exponents of mysticism have rendered valuable service in making mysticism more acceptable to the modern mind. They have shown the relation of mysticism to religion, and have pointed out the kinship which the mystic enjoys with the artist, the philosopher, and the scientist.

1. Hocking - op. cit. p.433.

Yet each chooses a different road to reach his goal. The philosopher and scientist are merely observers, surveying their goal from a distance with the cold light of reason. The artist approaches closer, for emotion will not survey just from afar. It must share. This is especially true of the mystic. He is a sharer, a partaker. Hocking has suggested the analogy of friendship to explain the mystic's relation to God. In friendship and love, the whole personality is called into play. There is a giving of all, a surrender. The self of the mystic enjoys friendship or fellowship with God. This self is not the psychical or psycho-physical self, but it is the higher self, the pure self, the true "I", closely related to the former, the more concrete, empirical aspects of self, yet less hampered, more possessive, the non-objective self. We are not able to objectify this self or such selves of others, but we know immediately that this non-objective self is real. Psychology cannot pass judgment on this self. It deals only with the psycho-physical self. Psychological critics have failed to recognize this. This self and its partner, the psycho-physical self, constitute the personality of man. This having been surrendered to God, becomes a heightened personality. Through this and to this the Divine personality communicates itself. God does not speak to and through degraded personalities, as some critics have suggested regarding the prophets and mystics, nor does he use the subconscious, as James¹ has suggested. As Pratt², another psychologist has said: "...it is difficult to see why God should choose to communicate with a split-off complex or a brain cell rather than with the man himself." Just as friend communicates with friend, the self of one with the self of the other, so God communicates with man, and where that self is a heightened personality/

1. James, op. cit.

2. Pratt, The Religious Consciousness, p.64.

personality, He makes Himself known most fully.

III. COMPARISON.

A. Metaphysics.

Already in this inquiry we have noted the marked differences between the Hebrew genius or spirit and that of other peoples. The Greek peoples were primarily philosophical. The races of the Orient were likewise. The Hebrew was not interested in metaphysics.

"No race has as the Indian over so long a period of time, concentrated the thought of its best minds on metaphysical speculations; no race that has profoundly influenced human culture has shown ¹ less interest in metaphysics than the ancient Jew."

The former began with their world and ended with God. The latter began with God, who explained all else.

The quest of the mystics of the Orient and of Christianity was primarily a religious one. They sought fellowship with God. In the background there was always a philosophical interest, and this moulded and shaped their mysticism. The prophetic mystic was not in the least a philosopher. Neither was Paul. He had the spirit and outlook of a Jew. He was not interested in metaphysical problems. His Logos conception may appear to be a philosophical interpretation of Christ. It was essentially religious, created to meet a heresy which tended to deny the lordship of Christ in His universe. For the apostle, Christ was supreme in the human heart, and it was but one further step to admit His supremacy in the world. This step was religious, not philosophical. Paul did not hesitate to take this step, but he went no further. His thought of God

1. Streeter - The Buddha and the Christ, p.43.

and Christ in relation to the world never goes beyond the conviction that "creation is built on redemptive lines."¹ The prophets had regarded the nation and the human heart as the sphere of God's redemptive activity. They also included creation, but it was secondary. Paul was one with the prophets. Religion, redemption, and God were the supreme facts of Paul's life and mysticism.

B. God, the World and History.

This marked unsimilarity of the Hebrew mind with that of other races is also prominent when one notes the attitudes of each to God, the world, and history. A comparison of the Greek and Hebrew minds has already been made,² but this difference is so marked and so important that it is worthy of repetition. The unphilosophical Hebrew regarded God as personal, whose will was righteous. He performed mighty acts in time, in the world process. Time embodied a Divine Plan, beginning in creation and leading to a great consummation. Associated with this Divine plan/^{there} was a Divine community, chosen to be the vehicle of God's purpose. The philosophical Greek, on the contrary, thought of God as an immovable Being who did not act in time, in history. The world process was a vain eternal recurrence, leading nowhere. Deliverance for the individual meant detachment of his soul from this world.³ The Oriental shared with the Greek this same view of God, the world, and history. The Greek was led to these conclusions by his dualistic philosophy; the Oriental by his pantheistic and monistic speculations. Dualism and monism are much akin. One says that the world is evil; the other that it is illusion. The Hebrew opposed these affirmations with the reply, "God saw that it was good."

Dr. Bevan has described the essential elements in Christianity as..

1. Strachan - The Historical Jesus, p.70.

2. p. 215-216.

3. p. 186-187.

"(1) The belief in mighty, creative, and redemptive acts of God; (2) in a world-plan initiated and carried out by such acts and leading up to a great future consummation; (3) in connecting the world-plan with a Divine community." ¹

Christianity's attitude to God, the world, and history is primarily religious, and Hebraic and the apostle shared in this.

C. Mysticism.

1. The Mystics.

Mysticism is religion in its ^{most} intense and most passionate form. The manner in which mysticism finds expression is determined by the spirit and temper of the peoples where it is found. The great mysticisms of history—Oriental, Christian, and Prophetic—have been moulded and shaped by the respective genius or spirit of each—the Oriental, the Greek, and the Hebraic. The Oriental mystic was little concerned with this world, history, and time. He turned to another world. The doctrine of "maya", or the illusion of the self and the material world, directed the Hindu mystic's quest to Brahman in the world of reality beyond. Here also the mystic of Buddhism sought Nirvana. In Sufism, the mystical passion and quest were not so subservient to the Oriental pantheistic and monistic spirit and temper, yet the latter were in evidence. When this was the case, the Sufi mystic forsook his world completely. Christian mysticism was Hebraic in character, but its expression was influenced by the Greek genius. The Christian Ascetic mystic accepted the dualistic thinking of his Greek world, and turned to the world of the spiritual beyond. Even the

1. Bevan and Singer - op. cit. p.195. After Christianity had passed over into Europe and had lost many of its Hebrew characteristics, these essential elements were modified by the Greek temper and spirit. Christian mysticism illustrates this.

Christian mystical Humanist is more Platonic and Greek than Hebraic, and although the world mirrored the Divine, history and time were not central in his thinking.

The Oriental and Greek temper and spirit turned the mystic in his quest for God to another world. In so doing, these also determined the manner in which the mystic would reach God, the goal of his quest. In all cases, it was world renunciation and world flight. The way of the Hindu mystic was a life of asceticism and contemplation. The followers of Buddha chose the Holy Eightfold Path, also ascetic and contemplative in character. The Sufi mystic's doctrine of the Law, Path, and Truth was similar. The Christian Ascetic mystic had his "Via Negativa", with its mystical ladder of purgation, contemplation, and union.

The mystic's experience on reaching his goal was influenced in like manner. The "Atman" in the soul of the Hindu mystic became united with the "Brahman" of the universe. This took place after he had left his world and his fellowmen behind. The experience was individualistic, ineffable, and of short duration. At times it became almost an absorption in the Divine, and the loss of all consciousness. This is the logical outcome of the Indian philosophical doctrine of "maya", or the illusion of the self and the material world. After the termination of this experience, the mystic returned to his world. The Buddhistic mystic's enjoyment of Nirvana was similar. This also was determined by the Indian temper and outlook. Sufism was less philosophical and pantheistic. Allah was regarded as personal and moral. The unitive life was the last stage of the Sufi's flight. Love characterized this. The Sufi

had left behind many of the undesirable traits of his fellow mystics, yet he had a doctrine of "fana", the passing away of the self, and also deification, which are open to some condemnation. These were the offshoots of the philosophical spirit of his day. The God revealed by Christ was the God of the Christian mystic, a deity who was personal and moral. Oft-times the Greek mind and temper gained the ascendancy, and then the Platonic Absolute was in danger of replacing the God of Christ. This Greek influence was more often felt when the Ascetic mystic was united with his God. The dualism of Greek thought was world-renouncing. The mystic's experience was therefore a "flight of the alone to the Alone", and like that of his predecessors, individualistic, ineffable, and of short duration. The pantheism of pseudo-Dionysius encouraged the doctrines of absorption and deification, but these were held well in check by the religious and Christian thought of God as personal, a God revealed by Christ, with whom the mystic enjoyed a personal fellowship.

The Oriental and Greek genius and spirit influenced also the ethics of mysticism. The "Brahman" of the Hindu and the Absoluté connected with the Nirvana of Buddha were not thought of as deities, who were personal and moral. Therefore morality was a secondary consideration.

The ascetic discipline of the Hindu and the followers of Buddha in their flight to their Goal was partially ethical in character, yet ethics were lacking in the final stages. With both, their morality and ethics were separated from their religion or mysticism, being but the brief prologue in the mystic flight. Allah, the God of the Sufi, was regarded as personal, having a moral will. Ethics and morality were therefore more important factors in this

mysticism. The mystic way was especially a moral discipline. The doctrine of "fana", the passing away of the self, implied the death of the old man. "Baqa," union with the Divine, implied also a oneness with the will of Allah. Love constituted the unitive life with God, and to love God, the Sufi must also love his neighbour. The unitive life was therefore moral. With the Sufi there was not such a cleavage between his religion or mysticism and his morality, yet the dividing line was present. In his flight to God, he was not so concerned with morality and ethics as later, on his return to the world.

The first stages of the mystic way associated with the Christian Ascetic mystic were ethical. There was a purgation from sin. The dualism of Greek thought tended to bring to the fore the metaphysical problem of evil, and too often the "Via Negativa" was looked upon as a means of escape from this evil in the world and in the self, and the unitive stage as the complete attainment of this. When this dualism was confined to the background of the mystic's life, his experience of union was moral. Love was central in the mystic's unitive life with God, and on returning to the world he was more fitted to love his fellowmen.

2. The Prophets.

The finest illustration of the Hebrew genius is the prophets. They prophesied concerning a God who was personal, whose character was moral, and whose will was righteous. He was one who stepped into time to work out His will and purpose. Israel's past spoke of this, and future history would illustrate this further. He had a Divine plan for Israel and the world. Israel as a nation would share in it. The prophets trusted in God concerning this; they

were men primarily religious, men of faith. Faith and trust describe their fellowship or relationship with God. There was no need of world renouncement and world flight to God. The prophet did not forsake his fellowmen and flee to God; God drew near to him. He created this fellowship.

Since God was moral, this relationship of faith or trust was moral also. Sin, not metaphysical evil, was the primal concern of the prophet. Sin was contrary to the will and purpose of God. This fellowship especially as seen in the life of Jeremiah was not individualistic, ineffable, and of short duration. It was not characterized by ecstasy, absorption, or deification. The personality of the prophet was not submerged in the personality of God. No metaphysical considerations led the prophet to these conclusions. There was no return to the world,¹ for the prophet had never left the world. In his world he enjoyed this fellowship, his world of daily living. Here in this world, by means of a normal moral relationship of faith or trust, God's righteousness, His mercy and forgiveness, were made known unto the prophet. There was also no cleavage, no division between the prophet's religion or mysticism and his ethics or morality. Since his God was moral and his relationship with Him was moral, his relationship with his fellowmen must be moral also.

3. Paul.

The apostle is a Hebrew; his mysticism is akin to that of the prophets. At Calvary God had stepped upon the stage of the world's history. In Christ's life, death, resurrection, present redeeming activity, and early return, Paul believed that God had made known His gracious will and loving purpose, and had

1. Hocking attempts to justify the negative path of the mystic, his flight to God and his return to the world, by what he calls the principle of alternation. Prophecy does not illustrate this. The mystic's flight and return were due rather to his philosophical pantheism, monism or dualism which relegated God to the world beyond the material and time.

performed the mightiest of His saving acts. With this Christ, the apostle had fellowship. His mysticism was a History mysticism; it was grounded upon this tremendous historical fact. Further, the apostle sought to re-enact the historic drama of Calvary in his own life; his mysticism was a Cross and Resurrection mysticism.

Like ^{that of} the prophets, the apostle's relationship with the Divine was one of faith or trust. By faith, Paul had surrendered himself to Christ, in whom God had drawn near to men to redeem. His mysticism was a Christ or Faith mysticism. The faith or trust of the prophets had come to its full completion in the apostle. Paul's faith called into play his whole personality—heart, mind, and will. This mystical faith relationship was personal, inward, and passionate, and covered every phase of the apostle's life. It was moral and ethical in character, for Christ and His cross were two of the most tremendous moral facts which Paul had ever encountered. His mysticism was an Ethical mysticism. This risen Christ was the source, ground, and goal of the apostle's mystical life. The prophets ^{neither} did not separate their religion from their morality, and ^{neither} did Paul. His mystical faith relationship with Christ was moral and this included within its bounds his fellow Christians, in a relationship of love. This was the koinonia, the Church, the mystical fellowship of the believers. Both Pauline and Prophetic mysticism rejected completely world negation and world flight; the mystic way of ascent from the world, history, and time to the Divine; asceticism, ecstasy, absorption, deification or return to the world. Paul had kinship with the prophets.

to Israel driven by Divine compulsion. They had been chosen for this work,
and they could do nought else but prophesy.¹

3. Paul.

Wernle has expressed the opinion that "unless the apostolic element of his experience receives due recognition there can be no understanding of Paul."² Paul regarded himself as the true successor of the prophets, for his apostleship was in direct line with the prophetic office.³ At Damascus he had been called and set apart by God a chosen vessel,⁴ and this had been foreordained as in the case of the prophet Jeremiah.⁵ Paul had been appointed by God to be the apostle to the Gentiles.⁶ He held his commission direct from the living Lord.⁷ He was an apostle of Christ,⁸ and, like the prophets of old, he could not hold his peace, having been sent forth by God.⁹ His mission was to the Israel of God, to declare what God had done in Christ,¹⁰ and what the future consummation would bring.

E. Prophetic and Pauline Mysticism.

Differences.

The differences between the mysticism of the apostle and that of the prophets are only a matter of degree. Pauline mysticism is but Prophetic mysticism full blown, Prophetic mysticism having reached its complete development. The Prophetic and Pauline conceptions of God's relation to man illustrate this. Early prophecy proclaimed that Israel enjoyed a unique and intimate relationship with Jehovah.¹¹ From the time of Jeremiah onwards, the individual

1. Amos 7:5; Jer. 1:7; Is. 6:8. 2. Wernle - op. cit. p.8.
3. Burton - Galatians, Apostle, pp. 363-381.
4. Act. 9:15. 5. Gal. 1:15. 6. Jer. 1:5. 7. Gal. 1:16.
8. Gal. 1:1-12. 9. Rom. 1:1. 10. 1 Cor. 9:16-17; Jer. 20:7-9.
11. Hosea 2:19-20.

as well as the nation shared in this fellowship.¹ Prophecy, according to A. B. Davidson,² was due to two things. There was a yearning of the human heart to know the will of God and to have communion with Him. This yearning was common to men everywhere. The prophet was especially privileged to enjoy this communion and to be the mediator between man and God, because the nation shrank from hearing the voice of Jehovah directly. The prophet Jeremiah sought to extend this privilege to the individual as well as ^{to} the nation.³ A. B. Davidson describes this prophet in these words: "...all his thoughts are coloured by the religious relation to God of which he himself was conscious."⁴ It was Jeremiah who portrayed this prophetic fellowship in its finest form, and it was he who made the discovery that God desired that not only the prophet but every member of Israel should share in that fellowship, that God sought to establish such an intimate relationship, not only with the nation, but with every individual within it. The mystical communion of the apostle Paul with Christ was but this fellowship with Jehovah which Jeremiah enjoyed, only more personal,⁵ intimate and intense. Like the prophet also, the apostle sought to share this privilege with others; he extended it to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews.

Paul's mysticism and that of the prophets can be named a history mysticism, and in this respect also the apostle is the successor of the prophets. For the prophets, history was a record of certain mighty acts of God beginning at creation, continuing throughout Israel's history, and leading up to a great consummation. These mighty acts revealed the character and will of God, a

God holy, righteous and just, One who willed to redeem Israel and the world.

1. Jer. 9:24; Ps. 23; 27; 28.

2. A. B. Davidson - Prophecy and the Prophets, H.D.B. p. 113-114.

3. Jer. 31:33-34. 4. A.B.Davidson - Jeremiah, H.D.B. p.576.

5. Kennedy - St. Paul's Conception of the Knowledge of God, Exp.xvi, p.258. Dr. Kennedy suggests that it is no rash hypothesis to claim that Jeremiah's experience impressed the apostle greatly and that their conceptions of communion with the Divine had much in common. Gal. 1:15; 1 Cor. 9:16.

Prophetic mysticism was therefore a history mysticism centred in a God who used history as a vehicle for revealing Himself; it was a God mysticism. Pauline mysticism was a history mysticism also. The life, death, and resurrection of Jesus were the mightiest of God's redeeming acts in history. The return of Christ would usher in the final consummation. This greatest of all interventions of God in history in Christ revealed Him as a God of grace and love. The apostle's mysticism was therefore a history mysticism, Christ-centred; it was a Christ mysticism.

Faith mysticism describes the mysticism of the prophets and of Paul, and this faith mysticism which had its beginnings in the prophets found its completion in the apostle. The prophets were men of faith; it was a relationship of faith which linked them with their God. They believed in, trusted and were loyal to Jehovah. Their spiritual fellowship of faith involved the activity of their whole personality. Jehovah was just, holy, righteous, and redeeming; they must have faith in Him, ^{and} live in a spiritual faith relationship with Him. Paul lifted this faith fellowship to a still higher level. God as revealed in Christ crucified and risen, was a God of redeeming grace and love. The apostle's conception of faith was therefore enriched and deepened. Faith implied a complete surrender of the whole personality to Christ, a surrender of the feelings, intellect, and will. Belief, trust, faith and fidelity were all implied in Paul's conception of faith. His mystical faith relationship with Christ was consequently more personal, intimate, and passionate than that of the prophets. An examination of the mystical phrases, "in Christ,"

"Christ in me", and "dying and rising with Christ," which the apostle used to describe that relationship, clearly shows this to be true. These phrases reveal the nearness, intimacy, oneness, and inwardness of that bond between Paul and Christ. They portray a union so close that the personality of the apostle is blended or absorbed in that of Christ, a fellowship wherein Paul shares all the experiences of Christ, His life, death, and resurrection, a relationship in which Christ is the source, ground, and goal of the apostle's life.

The Sacramental mysticism of the apostle cannot be traced back to prophetic mysticism. Sacramentalism was not known to the prophets. Paul's mystical conception of the Church was but a further development of the prophetic conception of the Israel of God, and his Ethical mysticism finds its source and inspiration in the Ethical mysticism of the prophets.

IV. Summary.

The mystic, Paul, is one with all mystics, Oriental and Occidental, who have sought fellowship or communion with God. He is a near relation of the Christian mystic, Ascetic and Humanist, whose mysticism was at heart a Christ mysticism. He is a brother of the Prophetic mystic. His genius was religious and akin to the Hebrew. His attitude to God, the world, history, and time was Old Testament. His mysticism was a Faith mysticism, the crown and completion¹ of Prophetic mysticism. His apostleship and mission were prophetic.

1. The comparison made in the pages of this section points out more fully the striking contrasts between the mysticism of the apostle and that of Hellenism (outlined in Chap. IV) and substantiates more firmly the conclusion that Paul was a Hebrew, indebted to the Hebrew world and not to the Greek.

CONCLUSION

"Paul, 'the apostle to the Gentiles,' the first great Christian missionary and theologian. He holds a place in the history of Christianity second only to that of the Founder Himself."

J. V. Bartlet.

"The supreme achievement of Paul lies in the fact that he taught the Church, which had hitherto used only the past and the future tenses when it thought of Christ to use the present tense as well. Christ to Paul was not only a great memory and a great hope, He was also a living present reality. The living Christ was as great an actuality in the experience of Paul as the historical Jesus was to the disciples on the hills of Galilee."

H. T. Andrews.

Having reached the end of our inquiry, we must now summarize our results. This investigation was divided into two parts. The first was confined to the field of New Testament criticism; the second, to the field of mysticism. At the outset we accepted provisionally a definition of mysticism and the fact that Paul's religious experience was mystical. It was discovered that the apostle's mysticism took its rise in his conversion crisis at Damascus. These days determined greatly the character of his mysticism. It was then that Paul tested Judaism, found it wanting, and abandoned it. He came into also / contact with Christianity and its Founder, through the gospel of the first Christians and more especially, their lives. They converted the apostle to their Christianity, and this became the basis of Paul's mysticism. They also formed the link between the apostle and Jesus. Paul's conversion experience moulded and shaped this mysticism. The crisis at Damascus was an inward revelation to the soul of Paul that the cross had not been God's curse upon Jesus, but

on the contrary, that in the Crucified One God had reconciled man to Himself. At that conversion hour, the truth was driven home to the soul of the apostle that Christ who had been crucified was risen and living, living on in that fellowship formed by His followers and in their lives.

A faith surrender followed which resulted in a union or mystical fellowship with the risen Christ. This faith union was closely related to and influenced to a great degree the apostle's conception of the Church, the sacraments, ethic, Holy Spirit, and eschatology. In this mystical faith relationship, the resurrection and especially the cross of Christ were central. Grace and love were the key words. This faith fellowship called into activity the whole personality of the apostle—his heart, mind and will. Faith was the beginning and ground of this fellowship.

Paul's mysticism took its rise in his conversion crisis, and it was rooted in Jesus and the Old Testament. These were the formative factors determining its character. During the apostle's day, mysticism was to be found in Judaism, and it flourished in the Hellenic world, but Paul was little indebted to either. Paul did not change Christianity into a new Judaism. His conversion crisis was too much of a right-about-face to permit this. Consequently, he sifted out its gold from the dross and carried this over into Christianity. There was the other possibility that the apostle to the Greek world might have transformed Christianity into a religion similar to that found in Hellenism. Paul was too much of a Jew, and he was too conscious of that which was inherent in Christianity which neither needed nor would permit this to take place. The

apostle may have been partially indebted to Hellenism for his vocabulary and the forms and thought categories in which he couched Christianity. These were the garments with which he clothed Christianity and made it acceptable to Hellenism. In this regard only is Paul a debtor to the Greeks.

The second part of this investigation took us into the field of mysticism. The great mysticisms of history, Oriental — Hinduism, Buddhism, and Sufism—,Christian — the mysticism of the Ascetic and Humanist and finally the Prophetic, were examined. The views of the critics and exponents of mysticism were then discussed. This phase of our inquiry was for the purpose of substantiating the writer's earlier choice of a definition of mysticism which he had taken from Rufus Jones; mysticism is religion at its most acute, intense and living stage, or in the writer's own words, it is personal fellowship with God. It was concluded that Paul's religion was mystical. A comparison was made then of the apostle's mysticism with the great branches of mysticism in history, and Paul's mysticism was classified as Prophetic. The noting of the differences between the mysticism of the apostle and that of the prophets terminated the inquiry.

This concludes our investigation, but a word might be added regarding the apostle, his mysticism, his greatness and worth for this day and generation. The apostle is one of the greatest figures in the history of Christianity. That greatness is due to the many-sidedness of the man, to Paul the missionary, Church statesman, thinker, theologian, and defender of Christian freedom, but more especially to the religious genius, Paul the mystic. The apostle's supreme

achievement and greatness lies in the fact that, on the one hand, he saved Christianity from becoming a new legalism looking to the past, to the memory and teachings of Jesus, while on the other hand, he prevented it from developing into an emotionalism and fanaticism without moral or intellectual foundations. The gaze of Christianity had been focussed backward to the past, to Jesus in the days of His flesh; He was a great memory. It was also fastened upon the future, looking to Him who was expected to return shortly; He was a great hope. The present age inaugurated by the resurrection, the new age of the Spirit, had not been linked with that past and future. The apostle did this. The gaze of Christianity had been turned backward and forward. Paul directed it upward to God, and interpreted that past and future in terms of the redeeming activity of God's grace and love. And more especially the apostle focussed the gaze of Christianity upon the present epoch, and taught Christianity to look at it in the light of that past and future and ^{of} Him in whom God had intervened to work out His saving purpose, namely Jesus Christ; He was a living, present actuality for the apostle. As well as the Jesus of Nazareth and the Christ of the Parousia, Christianity now came to know the risen and ever-present Lord, and to experience what Paul believed to be the crowning fact of this present era, inaugurated by the resurrection, the continued, redeeming activity of God through mystical fellowship with Christ.

This was the supreme achievement and contribution of the apostle. In doing this, he pointed out the uniqueness and timelessness of Christianity. It was a fellowship centred in a Person in whom the Timeless had broken into time,

in whom God had intervened in man's world to redeem. Since it was a fellowship with this Person, it was personal, inward and spiritual, a religion of the Spirit, capable of change and endless adaptation. Since in this Person God, because of grace and love, had intervened for purposes of redemption, this fellowship, this religion was inexhaustible in saving dynamic and power, impossible of being superseded, a religion timeless and eternal.

.....

----APPENDICES----

APPENDIX A.

Dr. Denney's and Dr. Peake's views of the Apostle's union with Christ.

Dr Denney is the chief exponent of the view that Paul's union with Christ was moral only. In his book "The Death of Christ", one notices his dislike of the mystical interpretation, but he does not repudiate it completely. On page 143 in a footnote, he directs a jibe at those who accept the mystical conception. Further on, in discussing Pfleiderer's conception of Paul's doctrine of reconciliation — judicial and ethico — mystical, p.179 - 185, he recognizes the possibility of a mystical union if it is regarded "not as a substitute for, but the fruit of, the vicarious death of Christ," p.185. In his article in the Expositor, Dr. Denney takes a more extreme position in regard to the mystical interpretation of Paul's union with Christ. He denies the possibility of such a view (see the quotation on p.83). The apostle's relationship with Christ is moral only; it is a union of wills. When discussing the representative and substitutionary conceptions of atonement, he states his own particular view of mysticism; "...and speak of a mystical union with Christ in which we are lifted above the region of reflection and motive, of gratitude and moral responsibility, into some kind of metaphysical identity with the Lord, does not promote intelligibility to say the least," (op. cit. p.256). Dr. Denney's own definition of mysticism and his concern to defend his view of the atonement and of Christ's death as vicarious explain his repudiation of the mystical conception of Paul's union with Christ. Certain mystical interpretations minimize the importance of Christ's vicarious death. According to these salvation is due, not so much to the atoning work of Christ, but to the mystical union of the believer with Christ; it is the fruit of man's endeavour, not of

Christ's. The writer is in complete agreement with Dr. Denney in his concern to point out how significant and important the atoning work of Christ was in the thought of Paul. Like Dr. Denney also, he cannot find that type of mysticism illustrated by the preceding quotation, in the thought and teaching of the apostle. He disagrees with Dr. Denney in his conception of mysticism and his overemphasis of the doctrine of justification by faith to that extent that he ignores the apostle's conception of mystical union with Christ. The writer follows Dr. Peake in accepting a broader definition of mysticism, and in regarding the apostle's doctrine of justification by faith as belonging to his larger doctrine of mystical union with Christ.

Dr. Peake, in his reply to Dr. Denney (op. cit.) criticises the latter's position. He claims that the apostle would not have used the phrases, "in Christ dying and rising with Christ" and "Christ in me" if he had meant only a moral union, a union of wills. The phrase, "...nevertheless I live, yet not I but Christ liveth in me..." (Gal. 2:20, A.V.) describes far more than a moral union; "there has been a substitution of Christ for his own personality." (op. cit. p. 62.). "But he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit," (1 Cor. 6:17, A.V.) describes a relationship of personal identification. Commenting on this verse, Dr. Peake says, "In fact it is difficult to see how a mystical union could be better described than by this daring sentence." (op. cit. p. 62). Dr. Peake takes issue with Dr. Denney because he throws out of focus the whole presentation of the apostle's teaching, and shows a lack of sympathy with his mystical teaching, when he assigns such an important place to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith. This is also true in the sphere of the Christian life. Dr. Denney

regards gratitude as the motive power. In Dr. Peake's opinion, when Dr. Denney holds this view, he lays himself open to the charge of holding to a type of Deism which teaches that Christ alone redeems and yet leaves the redeemed to keep themselves; he accepts the notion of an absentee Christ. On the contrary, Dr. Peake regards the risen and ever-present Christ and fellowship with Him as the motive power.(op. cit. p.64-65).

Dr. Peake's own views of Paul's union with Christ have been stated more fully in his book, "The Servant of Yahweh." This union is mystical , a "union of the human spirit with Christ the Crucified and risen Lord .."(op. cit. p.260). "This is not merely a moral union, that is a union of will and thought. Such a union, of course, is involved; he wills the things which Christ wills, and judges as He judges. But the union of which Paul speaks is deeper and more intimate; it is a blending of personalities, in which, while in one sense the personalities remain distinct, in another sense they are one."(op. cit. p.264-5). Commenting on Paul's experience as described by Gal.2:20, Dr. Peake writes,..."He has transcended the narrow limits of his personality and become one with a personality vaster and more universal." (op. cit. p.265). In mystical fellowship with Christ, "he makes his own the experience through which Christ has passed. He suffers with Christ, he is nailed to His Cross, he dies and rises with Him, he sits with Him in the heavenly places. He shares Christ's status before God, His character and His destiny. In Christ he is a new creature..." (op. cit. p.269)

The writer's position is but a further development of Dr. Peake's views. On pages 38 to 41, the moral and mystical phases of Paul's union with

Christ were brought out more fully. In the opinion of the writer, the apostle's conception of faith is mystical; faith demands the surrender of the whole personality, heart, mind, and will, to the risen Lord, (See pages 84-86). In his treatment of Paul's mystical phrases, Chapter III, the writer seeks to point out more clearly the passion, intimacy and oneness of the apostle's mystical fellowship with the risen Lord. (See especially pages 90-92, 97, 101). Paul mystically shared Christ's experience, especially His death and resurrection. Christ was his life, its source, ground, and goal.

.....

APPENDIX B.

I. THE CROSS AND RESURRECTION

A. Christ Crucified.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>2COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>
3:24	1:17-23	1:5.	1:3-6	1:5-9	1:29
5:6-10	2:2	4:10-16	2:20	2:16	3:18
8:17-18	6:20		3:1	4:32	<u>COL.</u>
14:15	8:11		5:11	5:1-2	1:15
15:5	11:1		6:12-17	5:25	1:24
					3:13-14

B. Christ Crucified and Risen.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>	<u>1. THESS.</u>
4:25	2:8	5:14-21	2:5-11	2:12 -3:1	4:14.
6:3-11	15:3	13:3-4	3:10		
7:4					
8:32-39					
14:9					

C. Christ Risen.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
1:3	15:13-20	1:1	3:1
6:4			
8:11	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>1. THESS.</u>
10:9	2:14	1:19-20	1:10

II. GRACE.

A. Grace of God.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
15:15	9:8	1:15	1:6
<u>1 COR.</u>	1:12	<u>EPH.</u>	
15:10	6:1	3:2	
3:10	8:1	3:7	

B. Grace of Christ.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>2 THESS.</u>
1:5	8:9	16:8	4:23	3:18
16:20	12:9	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>1 THESS.</u>	<u>PHILEM.</u>
16:24	13:14	16:23	5:28	25

C. Grace of God revealed in Christ.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>2 THESS.</u>	<u>PHILEM</u>
3:23-24	1:2	1:3-6	1:2	1:2	
5:1-21	9:14	2:21	1:6-7	1:16	3.
<u>1 COR.</u>	5:14-21	<u>PHIL.</u>	2:5-8	2:16	
1:3-4		1:2			

D. Grace.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>1 THESS.</u>
4:4	10:30	2:9	3:8	1:7	1:7
4:16		5:4	4:7		
6:1	<u>COL.</u>	1:15	4:29		
6:14	3:16	4:15	6:24		
11:5-6	4:6	8:6-7			
12:3	4:18	8:19			
12:6					

III. LOVE

A. Love of God.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>COL.</u>	<u>1 THESS.</u>	<u>2 THESS</u>
1:7	3:14	1:6	3:12	1:4	2:16
1:28				4:9	3:5
13:11					

B. Love of Christ.

<u>GAL.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>2 THESS.</u>
2:20	2:4	5:25	2:12	2:13
	3:16-29	6:23		
	5:2			

C. Love of God in Christ

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>
3:24	5:14-21
5:1-17	
8:32-39	

IV. CHRIST MYSTICISM

A. Fellowship.

<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>
1:9	3:10

B. Christ's Ownership.

1. Apostle of Christ	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
	1:1	1:1	1:1	1:1

2. Servant of Christ.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
1:1	7:22	1:10	6:6	1:1	4:12

3. Prisoner of Christ.

4. Ownership.

5. Miscellaneous.

<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHILEM.</u>	<u>ROM.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>
3:1	1		5:24	2:15
4:1	9	14:8	6:17	3:3
				5:19

C. "In Christ" etc.

1. Union, Oneness of relationship.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
7:4	6:16-17	1:8	2:6-7

2. Christ the Sphere, the Ground.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>1 THESS.</u>
3:24	1:30	4:6	1:3		
6:23	4:15	5:19	1:19-20	3:6	
8:39		5:21	2:7	3:11	5:18
16:9					

3. Transformation, Progress, Goal.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>
6:1-14	1:2	2:20	4:21-24	3:8-15
8:1-2		3:26-27	5:8	
8:10	<u>2 COR.</u>	6:15		<u>COL.</u>
13:14	5:17			3:3-10

4. Varied Aspects, covering whole gamut of Paul's life.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
9:1	1:5	2:14	1:1	1:13	1:1
14:6	2:16	2:17	1:13	1:21	2:5-6
14:8	3:1	2:19	1:15	1:26	2:16
14:14	4:10	4:19	2:6	2:1	3:4
15:17	4:15	9:2	3:6	2:11	3:18
16:2-3	4:17	11:11	4:17	2:19	4:5
16:7-8	7:39	13:3-4	6:1	2:29	4:7
16:10	9:1	<u>GAL.</u>	6:10	3:1	4:17
16:12-13	11:1	2:4	6:21	4:1-2	<u>1 THESS.</u>
16:22	15:15	5:6	<u>PHILEM.</u>	4:4	3:8
	15:18-19	5:10	16	4:7	4:1
	15:22		20	4:10	4:16
	15:31			4:13	5:12
	15:58				

5. No Dualism.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>PHILEM.</u>
12:1-2	7:1	1:20	16
<u>1 COR.</u>	4:10-11		
6:20	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>	
7:34	2:20	2:17	

D. "Christ in Me" etc.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>EPH.</u>
8:10	1:15-16	4:16	
	2:20	13:3	3:17
	4:19	13:6	

E. Dying and Rising with Christ.

<u>ROM.</u>	<u>1 COR.</u>	<u>2 COR.</u>	<u>GAL.</u>	<u>PHIL.</u>	<u>COL.</u>
6:2-12		1:5	2:20	1:20-21	
8:17-18	4:10-13	1:24-33	5:24	1:29	2:12-
8:36	15:31	4:10-16	6:12	2:17	- 3:1
		6:9-10	6:14	3:10	
		13:9	6:17		

.....

APPENDIX C.

The Lord's Supper.

Oesterley, "Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy" holds that the Supper was the Kiddush meal. Drews, Spitta, Box, Burkitt, and Lietzmann (with reservations) are in agreement with him. The Kiddush consisted of a commemoration of the institution of the Sabbath and pointed back to the redemption from Egypt. This rite took place on Fridays, ushering in the Jewish Sabbath, and also on the eve of great festivals. Oesterley accepts the Fourth gospel dating, 13 of Nisan, Jn. 13:1, 14:24, and the shorter text of Luke. Following Wescott and Hort, he uses the codex D version and omits Lk. 22:19b-20. Jesus was accustomed to partake of such a meal with his disciples during his lifetime. This Kiddush was continued in the early Church, and was known as the Agape. It was associated with their apocalyptic expectations. Later, this developed into the Eucharist proper, under the influence of Paul. Lietzmann (Brillioth - Eucharistic Faith and Practice) differs slightly in his view. The Agape of the early Church had no relation to the Last Supper. It was a continuation of the Kiddush meals of Jesus' own lifetime. (Mk. 6:41; 8:6, Matt. 14:19; 15:36, Lk. 9:16) The essential point was the breaking of bread and thanksgiving, in glad expectation of the parousia, (Acts 2:42, 46). Mark gives the genuine tradition of the Last Supper. This is independent of Paul. The apostle, acting on the basis of a revelation from the Lord, remodelled the Agape on lines according to the Markan tradition, yet varying. Because of Paul, the Eucharist with its memorial aspect came into being. These scholars point to the Didache for a verification of their conclusions.

Dalman, "Jesus - Jeshua," on the contrary rejects the Fourth gospel dating. Mark is the authoritative source. The Last Supper was a Pascal meal.

He dismisses the difficulties of the trial and death of Jesus being carried out on the night of the Passover. Chwolson (arguments summarized in Klausner-Jesus of Nazareth, p.326-329, and Montefiore - Synoptic Gospels, p. 312) suggests that, while strict Pharisees were obliged to observe the Passover on that eve, others might celebrate it if they chose, on the evening preceding. Thus he overcomes the difficulties mentioned above, reconciles the conflicting chronologies, accepts the Synoptic tradition, and regards the Supper as a Pascal meal.

Schweitzer, (op.cit.) followed by Reville^{and}/ Goguel (Brilioth, op.cit.) accepts the Synoptic traditions. The Last Supper was not a Pascal or a Kiddush meal, but apocalyptic. For Paul it was a realistic sacramental rite (Schweitzer, Mysticism of Paul, p.269). For a full discussion of Schweitzer's view, refer to pp. 151-153.

Brilioth (op. cit.) ~~after~~ ably analyzing all the conflicting views and admitting the difficulties involved, concludes that the Markan account is pre-Pauline and goes back to the earliest period. The Last Supper continued the Kiddush meals of Jesus' lifetime. It had Pascal and apocalyptic significance also. Jesus' death inaugurated a new covenant and a new redemption. The Early Church emphasized the apocalyptic aspect, making the rite a fellowship, an Agape, in anticipation of the coming Kingdom. The thought of Christ's death was present, though not uppermost. It was left for Paul to emphasize this memorial or commemoration phase, and transform the rite from an Agape into the Eucharist. This view is accepted by many scholars, Srawley, Early History of the Liturgy; Macgregor, Eucharistic Origins.

APPENDIX D

The Prophets.

The great service of the early prophet in Israel was a double one. First, he insisted that sin was ethical and not ceremonial. Second, he maintained as a consequence that ceremonial worship was futile. Sin alone severed the relationship existing between man and God. For a restoration of this, two things were necessary, an act of penitence on man's part and an act of forgiveness on the part of God. These were within the ethical sphere. All the writers of the Old Testament speak of this fellowship with God as a life to God and with God..."This was their religion, a conscious fellowship with God." (A.B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p.4). This relationship is admirably portrayed in the account of the call of the prophet Isaiah, (Is.vi). The prophet is penitent and humble before Jehovah. He is conscious of God's transcendence, the "wholly-otherness," the holiness of God (this implies God's moralness as well as other aspects of His character). The prophet experiences what Otto terms a realizing sense of the "Numinous" (see p.234-235 for a full discussion of Otto's position.).

Unlike the prophets, the Oriental and Mediaeval mystics were metaphysicians, and not only sin but philosophical considerations (their pantheism and dualism) prohibited the establishing of such a relationship with the Deity. The prophet was not a philosopher; he was concerned primarily with religious and moral, not intellectual and speculative questions. (This is the view of Streeter, thesis, p.237, and A.B. Davidson, op. cit. p.63 and thesis p.214. Adam Welch follows Davidson). The prophet begins with God, and his knowledge of God explains the world, nature, man, and history. For him God is essentially self-revealing. In the Old Testament, all knowledge of God rests upon the fact

that God was not an object of contemplation or abstraction. The prophet did not rise to his conception of God or attain to know His will by reflection. God called the prophet, established a fellowship with him, and made His character and will known to him.

A. B. Davidson (op. cit. p.75-78), discussing the fact that the scriptures assume the knowability of God, comments on this further. First, it is hardly needful to prove that scripture teaches or assumes that God may be known (Ps. 46:10; Jer. 31:34; Deut. 4:35). Second, scripture maintains regarding this knowledge that it was a fellowship with God. The prophet in fellowship with God experiences the Divine and comes to a knowledge of Him. By means of this fellowship, God, who is self-revealing, makes Himself known to the prophet. The prophet does not establish this relationship. God draws near, creates it, and makes it possible for man to enjoy this fellowship. (See also H. W. Robinson, op. cit. p.118-119; A. B. Davidson thesis p.220). The God thus revealed is both personal and spiritual. He is a personality not identical with nature or involved in it. He stands over against nature, distinct from it. He is personal. God is also a person whose character is spiritual and moral (A. B. Davidson, op. cit. p. 106-107). The prophets emphasized especially this fact. Since God was both personal and moral, this fellowship established between the prophet and God was personal and moral. It was also a faith relationship, for the prophet had faith in the moral character and will of God.

.....

APPENDIX E

Fellowship with the Divine.

It is possibly necessary to define and explain more fully the phrase, fellowship with the Divine. Like the word, religion, it might be taken in its narrower sense as referring to that relationship which involves only the Divine and man; e. g. ".walk humbly with thy God." (Mic. 6:8, A.V.)"..love the Lord thy God..."(Lk. 10:27,A.V.). Its broader meaning implies that this Divine-human fellowship or relationship includes within its limits a human relationship also. This fellowship or relationship links man with God and also man with man; e. g. ".What does the Lord require of thee, but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"(Mic. 6:8,A.V.);"..Thou shalt love the Lord thy God...and thy neighbour as thyself."(Lk.10:27,A.V.). The prophet's, and especially the apostle Paul's mysticism or fellowship (see p.43

) illustrates the dual character of this relationship. The writer accepts this wider meaning of the phrase, fellowship with the Divine. He is in agreement with A.B. Davidson, H.W. Robinson, and A. Welch in their broader interpretation of the meaning of the word, fellowship. (See p. 266). They speak of the prophet as enjoying fellowship with God. It was a fellowship wherein God, the prophet, and his fellowmen were involved, wherein religion in the narrower sense and morality were wedded. (Mic. 6:8). This fellowship enjoyed by the prophet implied belief, worship, and service. The prophet had knowledge of Jehovah as a redeeming God, and he believed or trusted in Him. He worshipped and served Him as the only living and true God. This involved the mind, heart, and will of the prophet. Otto (see for a full discussion p.234-5) roots religion in an experience of the "Numinous," a realizing sense of the Divine.

presence. According to Otto, this experience of the "Numinous" involves mainly the feelings of man. Hocking has developed this position further, allying this experience of the "Numinous" with the rational and moral as well as the emotional part of man's being. In this mystical experience, this relationship or fellowship with God, the whole personality is involved—the mind, will, and heart. This fellowship also deepens and enriches, and it becomes more personal, intimate, and passionate as a fuller revelation or knowledge of God's character is given. The fellowship enjoyed by the Oriental mystic is of a lower character. Prophetic mysticism ranks higher. Christian mysticism, since it thought of God in terms of grace and love, as One Who had drawn near to man in Jesus Christ, portrays this fellowship in its finest form.

.....

APPENDIX F

The Views of Rufus Jones.

Rufus Jones accepts a broad definition of mysticism. He rejects that view of mysticism in its narrow and exact historical sense based upon Mediaeval mysticism, which defines it as a doctrine of union with God implying a metaphysical conception of God and the human soul borrowed from Neo-Platonism, and a mystic way, the "Via Negativa", by which union is attained with the Absolute. (See Jones - Mysticism, E.R.E., Vol.9, p. 84). Mysticism is rather an "immediate experience of divine-human intercourse and relationship" (op.cit. p.83), "a type of religion which is characterized by an immediate consciousness of personal relationship with the Divine". (Jones - Studies in Mysticism Religion, p.xviii). Discussing this question further, he points out that there is a mystical element in prayer, whenever it rises to the level of real communion. He describes these periods as a "joyous fellowship," "fellowship with the Divine Companion" (op. cit. p.xix). He regards the religion of the New Testament days as "religion in the intense stage... immediate and first-hand experience of God which is mysticism at its best, and in its truest meaning." (op.cit.p.5). Christ is the supreme model of the true mystic. (E.R.E. p.89). "Paul's 'Gospel' was deeply grounded in an immediate, personal experience of the Divine Being, who imprinted upon him, invaded him, and finally became the inward principle and spirit of his very self. (Studies in Mystical Religion, p.9). The mystic prayer of Johnxviii " utters the naked truth of a Divine-human fellowship.." (op. cit. p.19). According to Rufus Jones, mysticism is religion which is so intense and passionate that it is a Divine-human relationship or fellowship. In accepting this definition he rejects another narrower view of mysticism

which claims that it is a special or exceptional experience, abnormal in character, and sometimes pathological, a form of disease or manifestation of hysteria (refer to Janet, Leuba, p.232). Mysticism is rather "a way of living which is as normal as healthy breathing;" "a life consummated in the practice of the Presence of God. It is life in its wholeness, as over against a partial life..." Further "the truly mystical may be summed up as simply a protest in favour of the whole man, the entire personality. (op. cit. p.xvii) "Christianity in the golden age (Apostolic) was essentially a rich and vivid consciousness of God, rising to a perfect experience of union with God in mind and heart and will"(op. cit. p.4) . This mystical Divine-human fellowship required the activity of the mystic's whole personality—his mind, heart and will. Rufus Jones does not regard this fellowship as purely individualistic in character. It is personal and also social. He points out that the mystics of history were the spiritual leaders of their age, men who contributed greatly to humanity in spiritual service,(op. cit. p.xxx). For a further discussion of Rufus Jones' contribution to the study of mysticism, refer to chapter V, pp. 233-234.

.....

-----○-----

A. NEW TESTAMENT.

1. PAUL.

Burton, E.	New Testament Word Studies	Chicago	1927
Bacon, B. W.	Jesus and Paul	Hodder & Stoughton	1920
Baur, F. C.	Paul, Vol. I	Williams & Norgate	1873
Cave, S.	The Gospel of St. Paul.	Hodder & Stoughton	1928
Deissmann, A.	Paul	" "	1926
"	The Religion of Jesus & Faith of Paul.	" "	1923
Dodd, H.	The Meaning of Paul for Today	Swarthmore	1920
Duncan, C.S.	St. Paul's Ephesian Ministry	Hodder & Stoughton	1929
Enslin, M.S.	The Ethics of Paul	Harpers	1930
Fletcher, R. J.	The Conversion of Paul	Bell	1910
Gardner, P.	The Religious Experience of Paul.	Williams & Norgate	1911
Glover, T.R.	Paul of Tarsus	S.C.M.	1925
Hatch, W.H.P.	The Pauline Idea of Faith	Harvard	1917
Jackson, Foakes	The Life of St. Paul	Cape	1927
Kennedy, H.A.A.	St. Paul. and the Mystery Religions.	Hodder & Stoughton	1913
"	St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things.	"	1904
Knox, W. L.	St. Paul and the Jerusalem Church.	Cambridge	1925
Knowling, R.J.	The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ.	Hodder & Stoughton	1905
Lake, K.	The Earlier Epistles of Paul.	Rivingtons	1911
Montefiore, C.	Judaism and St. Paul	Max Goschen	1914
Moffatt, J.	Paul and Paulinism	Riverside Press	1910
Peake, A. S.	Servant of Yahweh	Manchester	1931
Pfleiderer, O.	Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, tr. Smith	Williams & Norgate	1885
"	Paulinism, Vol. I & II	" "	1877
Porter, F.	The Mind of Christ in Paul	Scribners	1930
Ramsay, W.M.	St. Paul, the Traveller & Roman Citizen.	Hodder & Stoughton	1895
"	Pauline and Other Studies	" "	1906
"	The Cities of St. Paul	" "	1907
Strachan, R.H.	The Individuality of St. Paul	Clarke	1916
Schweitzer, A.	The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, tr. Montgomery.	Black	1931
"	Paul and His Interpreters, tr. Montgomery,	Black	1913
Sabatier, A.	The Apostle Paul, tr. Hellier	Hodder & Stoughton	1891
Scott, C.A.	Christianity according to St. Paul.	Cambridge	1927
Thackeray, H.St.J.	The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought.	Macmillan	1920
Weiss, J.	Paul and Jesus, tr. Chaytor	Harper	1909
Weinel, P.	St. Paul, The Man and His Work, tr. Brinemann	Williams & Norgate	1906
Wrede, W.	Paul, tr. Lummis	Green	1907

2. JESUS AND EARLY CHURCH.

Bell, G. and A.	Mysterium Christi	Longmans & Green	1930
Deissmann ed.			
Bulcock, H.	Religion and its New Testament Expression	Williams & Norgate	1928
Branscomb, B.H.	Jesus and the Law of Moses	Hodder & Stoughton	1930
Bartlet, V. and H.			
Andrews, ed.	The Lord of Life	S.C.M.	1929
Burkitt, F. C.	Christian Beginnings	U. of London	1924
Brunner, E.	The Word and the World	S.C.M.	1931
Bousset, W.	Kyrios Christos	Dandenhoeck & Ruprecht	1921
Case, S. J. ed.	Studies in Early Christianity	Century	1928
Cadbury, H.J.	The Making of Luke Acts	Macmillan	1927
Dalman, G.	Jesus-Jesuhā, tr. Livertoff	S.P.C.K.	1929
Denney, J.	The Death of Christ	Hodder & Stoughton	1902
Dobschutz, E. Von	The Eschatology of the Gospels	" "	1910
"	The Apostolic Age	Green	1909
Easton, B.S.	Christ in the Gospels	Scribners	1930
"	The Gospel before the Gospels	Allen Unwin	1928
Fletcher, M.S.	The Psychology of the New Testament.	Hodder & Stoughton.	1912
Fairweather, W.	Jesus and the Greeks	T.T. Clark	1924
"	The Background of the Gospels	"	1908
Goguel, M.	Jesus the Nazarene, tr. F. Stephens	Unwin	1926
Hoskyns, E. and N.			
Davey	The Riddle of the New Testament	Fabre & Faber	1931
Harnack, Von	Luke the Physician, tr. J. R. Wilkinson		
"	Acts of the Apostles " "	Williams & Norgate	1911
Hawkins, Sir John	Horae Synopticae	Oxford	1899
Jackson, Foakes and K. Lake	Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I&II.	Macmillan	1920
Klausner, J.	Jesus of Nazareth, tr. H. Danby	Allen & Unwin	1925
Lake, K.	The Stewardship of Faith	Christophers	1915
Moffatt, J.	Love in the New Testament	Hodder & Stoughton	1929
"	Grace in the New Testament	" "	1931
"	The Theology of the Gospels	Duckworth	1912
Montefiore, C.	The Synoptic Gospels	Macmillan	1909
Manson, W.	Christ's View of the Kingdom of God.	Clark	1918
Mackinnon, J.	The Historical Jesus	Longmans & Green	1931
McGiffert, A.C.	The History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age	T. T. Clark	1897
Peel, A. ed.	Essays Congregational & Catholic, C.H. Dodd, The Church in the New Testament.	Tinsley	1931
Rawlinson, A.E.J.	The New Testament Doctrine of Christ.	Green	1926
" ed.	Essays on the Trinity and Incarnation.	Longmans	1928

Robinson, H. Wheeler.	The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit	Nisbet	1928
Rees, T.	The Holy Spirit	Duckworth	1914
Riddle, D.W.	Jesus and the Pharisees	Chicago	1928
Strachan, R. H.	The Historical Jesus in the New Testament	S.C.M.	1931
Shaw, J.M.	The Resurrection of Christ	T.T. Clark	1920
Shafto, M.R.	The Reality of the Resurrection	S.C.M.	1930
Scott, E.F.	The Spirit in the New Testament	Hodder & Stoughton	1923
"	The Ethical Teachings of Jesus	Macmillan	1925
"	The Gospel and its Tributaries	T.T. Clark	1928
"	The Kingdom of God	Macmillan	1931
Schweitzer, A.	The Quest of the Historical Jesus, tr. Montgomery.	Black	1900
Streeter, B.H.	The Four Gospels	Macmillan	1924
" ed.	The Spirit	Macmillan	1920
Swete, H.B.	The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.	Macmillan	1909
Selwyn, E.G. ed.	Essays Catholic and Critical	S.P.C.K.	1926
Scott, C.A.	New Testament Ethics	Cambridge	1930
Wernle, Paul	The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I & II, tr. Bienemann	Williams & Norgate	1903
Weiszacher, C.	The Apostolic Age, Vol. I & II, tr. Millar	Williams & Norgate	1894
Wood, J.F.	The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature	Hodder & Stoughton	1904
Whitley, W.T.	The Doctrine of Grace, W. Manson, - Grace in the New Testament	S.C.M.	1932

3. SACRAMENTS.

Brilioth, Y.	Eucharistic Faith and Practice, tr. A. Hebert.	S.P.C.K.	1930
Lambert, J.C.	The Sacraments in the New Testament.	Clark	1903
Macdonald, C.H.	Eucharistic Origins	Clark	1928
Macgregor, A.J. ed.	The Evangelical Doctrine of Holy Communion	Heffer	1930
Oesterley, W.O.E.	The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy	Oxford	1925
Srawley, J.H.	The Early History of the Christian Liturgy	Cambridge	1913

4. MYSTERY RELIGIONS

Apuleius	Metamorphosis	Loeb Classics	1915
----------	---------------	---------------	------

Angus, S.	The Religious Quests of the Graeco Roman World	Murray	1929
"	The Mystery Religions and Christianity	"	1924
Bevan, E.	Sybilis and Seers	Allen & Unwin	1928
"	Stoics and Skeptics	Oxford	1913
"	Hellenism and Christianity	Allen & Unwin	1921
Burkitt, F.C.	Church and Gnosis	Cambridge	1932
Clemen, C.	Primitive Christianity and its non-Jewish Sources, tr. Nesbit.	T.T. Clark	1912
Cumont, F.	Astrology. Religion among the Greeks and Romans	Putnam	1912
"	Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism.	Trubner	1911
Deissmann, A.	Light from the Ancient East, tr. Strachan.	Hodder & Stoughton	1927
Dill, S.	Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius.	Macmillan	1904
Macchioro, V.D.	From Orpheus to Paul	Constable	1930
Lang, A.	Homeric Hymns	Allen	1899
Murray, G.	The Four Stages of Greek Religion	Oxford	1912
Reitzenstein, R.	Die Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen.	Trubner	1927
Scott, W.	Hermetica, Vol. I & II & III	Oxford	1924
Willoughby, H.R.	Pagan Regeneration	Chicago	1929
Harrison, J.	Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religions	Cambridge	1903

5. FOURTH GOSPEL.

Abbott, E.A.	Johannine Vocabulary	A.C. Black	1905
Bacon, B. W.	The Fourth Gospel	Fisher Unwin	1909
Charnwood, Lord	According to St. John	Hodder & Stoughton	1925
Carpenter, J.E.	The Johannine Writings	Constable	1927
Ely, M.R.	Knowledge of God in Johannine Thought.	Macmillan	1925
Findlay, G.G.	Fellowship in the Life Eternal	Hodder & Stoughton	1909
Garvie, A.E.	The Beloved Disciple	Hodder & Stoughton	1922
Johnston, J.S.	The Philosophy of the Fourth Gospel	Clowes	1909
Odeberg, H.	The Fourth Gospel	Boktrycheri	1929
Strachan, R.H.	The Fourth Evangelist	Hodder & Stoughton	1925
Scott, E.F.	The Fourth Gospel	T.T. Clark	1906
Watson, H.A.	The Mysticism of St. John's Gospel	Scott	1916

B. JUDAISM AND OLD TESTAMENT

1. JUDAISM

Abrahams, I.	Studies in Phariseism and the Gospels. 1st Series, 1917.	Cambridge	
		2nd Series	1924
Bevan, E.	Jerusalem under the High Priests	Arnold	1904

Burkitt, F.C.	Jewish and Christian Apocalypses	Oxford	1914
Box, G.H.	The Ezra Apocalypse	Putnam	1912
"	Apocalypse of Abraham	S.P.C.K.	1918
Bousset, W.	Die Religion des Judentums	Reuther & Reichard	1903
Charles, R.H.	The Apocalypse of Baruch	Black	1896
"	The Apocrypha & Pseudipigrapha, Vol. I&II.	Oxford	1913
Hollmann, G.	The Jewish Religion in the Time of Jesus, tr. Lummis	Green	1909
Herford, R.T.	Pharisaism	Williams & Norgate	1912
Kennedy, H.A.A.	Philo's Contribution to Religion	Hodder & Stoughton	1919
Lightley, J.W.	Jewish Sects and Parties in the Time of Christ	Epworth	1925
Myers, C.S. ed.	Judaism and the Beginnings of Christianity.	Routledge	1927
Moore, G.F.	Judaism, Vol. I & II	Harvard	1929
Odeberg, H.	Third Enoch	Cambridge	1928
Oesterley, W.O.E.	The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation	Sheffington	1910
"	The Wisdom of Solomon	S.P.C.K.	1918
Colson, E.H. and Whitaker, G.H. ed.	Philo	Loeb Classic	1932
Schürer	The History of the Jewish People, tr. Taylor	T.T. Clark	1901
Schechter, S.	Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology	Black	1909

2. OLD TESTAMENT

Bevan, E. and C. Singer, ed.	Legacy of Israel	Oxford	1927
Davidson, A.B.	The Theology of the Old Testament	T.T. Clark	1904
"	Old Testament Prophecy	"	1903
Micklem, N.	Prophecy and Eschatology	Allen & Unwin	1926
Oesterley, W.O.E. & T.H. Robinson	Hebrew Religion	S.P.C.K.	1930
Oesterley, W.O.E.	The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue	Pitman	1907
Peake, A.S. ed.	The People and the Book	Oxford	1925
Robinson, Wheeler.	The Religious Ideas of the Old Testament	Duckworth	1913
Robinson, T.H.	Prophecy and the Prophets	"	1923
Skinner, J.	Prophecy and Religion	Cambridge	1922
Smith, Robertson,	The Prophets of Israel	Black	1882
Welch, A.	The Religion of Israel under the Kingdom.	T.T. Clark	1912
"	Deuteronomy	Oxford	1932

C.MYSTICISM1. ORIENTAL

Bloomfield, M.	The Religion of the Veda	Putnam	1908
Cave, S.	Redemption Hindu and Christian	Oxford	1919
Deussen, P.	The Philosophy of the Upanishads, tr. Geden	T.T. Clark	1906
Gough, A.E.	The Philosophy of the Upanishads	Trubner	1882
Keith, A.B.	The Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads, Vol.31-32.	Harvard	1925
"	Buddhistic Philosophy	Oxford	1923
Moore, G.F.	History of Religions, Vol.I	T.T. Clark	1914
Macnicol, N.	Indian Theism	Oxford	1915
Milburn, R.G.	The Religious Mysticism of the Upanishads	Theosophical Pub- lishing House	1924
MacLagan, P.J.	Chinese Religious Ideas	S.C.M.	1926
Muller, Max.ed.	Sacred Books of the East, Vol.I, XV,	Oxford	1879, 1894
Nicholson, R.A.	The Mystics of Islam	Bell	1914
"	The Idea of Personality in Sufism	Cambridge	1923
Arnold, T. ed.	The Legacy of Islam, R. A. Nicholson- Mysticism	Oxford	1931
Otto, Rudolf	Mysticism East and West	Macmillan	1932
Oldenberg, H.	Buddha, tr. W. Hoey	Williams & Norgate	1882
Poussin, D.LaValle.	The Way to Nirvana	Cambridge	1927
W. Rhys Davids	Buddhism	Putnam	1907
Mrs. " "	Buddhism	Williams & Norgate	
Smith, M.	Studies in Early Mysticism in the Near and Middle East	Sheldon	1931
Soothill, W.E.	The Three Religions of China	Oxford	1928
Streeter, B.H.	The Buddha and the Christ	Macmillan	1932

2. CHRISTIAN

Butler, D.	Western Mysticism	Constable	1922
Guyon, M.	A Short and Easy Method of Prayer	London	1900
Baron Von Hugel.	The Mystical Element in Religion, Vol. I & II.	Dent	1909
Herman, E.	The Meaning and Value of Mysticism	J. Clarke	1915
A. Von Harnack	History of Dogma, tr. W.M. Gilchrist, Vol. VI	Williams & Norgate	1899
Inge, W.R.	Christian Mysticism	Methuen	1899
Jones, Rufus	Studies in Mystical Religion	Macmillan	1909
"	New Studies in Mystical Religion	"	1927
"	Spiritual Reformers in the 16th and 17th Centuries	"	1914
Kirk, K.E.	Vision of God	Longmans	1931
Lehmann, F.	Mysticism in Heathendom and Christianity, tr. G. Hunt	Luzac	1910

Reid, H.M.B.	The Holy Spirit and the Mystics	Hodder & Stoughton	1925
Ruysbroeck	Adornment of the Spiritual Marriage, ed. Underhill	Dent	1916
Tauler, John	The History of the Life of the Rev. Dr. John Tauler, tr. Winkworth	Elder	1857
Underhill, E.	Mysticism	Methuen	1910
"	The Mystic Way	Dent	1913

3. JEWISH

Abelson, J.	The Immanence of God in Rabbinic Literature	Macmillan	1912
"	Jewish Mysticism	"	1913
Gaster, M.	The Samaritans	Oxford	1925

4. PHILOSOPHICAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, CRITICAL

Bennett, C.A.	A Philosophical Study of Mysticism	Yale	1930
"	The Dilemma of Religious Knowledge	"	1931
Caird, E.	Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers, Vol. I & 2	MacLehose	1904
Coe, C.A.	The Psychology of Religion	U. of Chicago	1916
Delacroix, H.	Etudes sur le psychologie du mysticisme	Alcan	1908
Griffeths, R.	God in Idea and Experience	T.T. Clark	1931
Hocking, W.E.	The Meaning of God in Human Experience.	Yale	1912
"	Types of Philosophy	Scribners	1929
Heiler, Von F.	Das Gebet	Reinherdt	1921
Baron Von Hugel	The Reality of God and Religion and Agnosticism	Dent	1931
"	Essays and Addresses on the Philo- sophy of Religion	Dent	1921
Herrmann, W.	The Communion of the Christian with God, tr. J.S. Stranyon	Williams & Norgate	1895
Illingworth, J.R.	Personality Human and Divine	Macmillan	1894
James, W.	Varieties of Religious Experience	Longmans+Green	1902
Joly, Henri	The Psychology of the Saints	Duckworth	1902
Jones, Rufus	Pathways to the Reality of God	Macmillan	1931
Leuba, J.H.	The Psychology of Religious Mysticism.	Trubner	1925
Lang, L.W.	A Study of Conversion	Allen & Unwin	1931
Otto, Rudolf	Idea of the Holy, tr. J.W. Harney	Oxford	1923
"	Religious Essays, tr. B. Lunn	Oxford	1931
Paterson, W.P.	The Nature of Religion	Hodder & Stoughton	1925
Pratt, J.N.	The Religious Consciousness	Macmillan	1921
Recejac, E.	The Basis of Mystical Knowledge	Trubner	1899

Royce, J.	The World and the Individual, 1st Series.	Macmillan	1900
Ritschl, A.	The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, tr. H.R. Mackintosh	T.T. Clark	1900
Streeter, B. and A. Appasamy	The Sadhu	Macmillan	1921
Troeltsch, E.	The Social Teachings of the Christian Church, Tr. Wyon, Vol. II	Unwin	1931

D. MISCELLANEOUS

Hort, F.A.	The Christian Ecclesia	Macmillan	1898
Lindsay, T.M.	A History of the Reformation, Vol. I.	T.T. Clark	1906
Mackinnon, J.	Luther and the Reformation, Vol. I.	Longmanns & Green	1925

E. COMMENTARIES, ETC.

Burton, E.	Galatians	T.T. Clark	1921
Bernard, J.H.	The Gospel according to St. John, Vol. I & II.	"	1928
Dodd, C.H.	Romans	Hodder & Stoughton	1932
Frame, J.E.	Thessalonians	T.T. Clark	1912
Julicher, A.	An Introduction to the New Testament, tr. Ward	Elder	1904
Jackson, F.	Acts	Hodder & Stoughton	1931
Kennedy, H.A.A.	The Theology of the Epistles	Duckworth	1919
Locke, W.	Ephesians	Methuen	1929
Lightfoot, B.	Galatians	Macmillan	1900
"	Philippians	"	1883
Manson, W.	Luke	Hodder & Stoughton	1930
Michael, H.	Philippians	"	1927
Moulton, J.H.	The Grammar of the New Testament, Vol. I.	T.T. Clark	1908
" & G. Milligin.	The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament.	Hodder and Stoughton	1918
Moulton, F.W. and A.S. Geden	A Concordance to the Greek New Testament.	Clark	1897
Moffatt, J.	Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament	T.T. Clark	1911
Peake, A.S.	Commentary on the Bible	Jack	1920
Plummer, A.	Second Corinthians	T.T. Clark	1915
Nicoll, W.R. ed.	Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. II & III.	Hodder & Stoughton	1903
Robinson, A.	Ephesians	Macmillan	1903
Rawlinson, A.E. J.	Mark	Methune	1925
Robinson, A. and A. Plummer	First Corinthians	T.T. Clark	1911
Scott, E.F.	Colossians, Philippians and Ephesians	Hodder & Stoughton	1930
Wescott, B.F.	Ephesians	Macmillan	1906
"	The Epistle of St. John	"	1886

1. NEW TESTAMENTF. PERIODICALS

- Burkitt, J.V. Paul Ency. Britt. Vol.XVII 14th ed.
 Bultmann, R. The New Approach to the Synoptic Problem, Jour. Rel. Vol. VI (1926).
- Betts, A.E. The Johannine Doctrine of the Holy Spirit, Thesis, 1932.
 Creed, J.M. The Sacraments in the Fourth Gospel, Exp. 8th Series, Vol. VI
 " The Heavenly Man, Jour. Theol. Studies, Vol. XXVI
 " The Hermetic Writings, Jour. Theol. Stud. Vol. XV
 Carpenter, J.E. The Hermetica, Hibb. Jour. Vol. XXV
 Denney, J. The Theology of the Epistle to the Romans, Exp. Vol. IV
 " The Atonement and the Modern Mind " " VIII
 Dibelius, M. Jesus and Contemporary German Theology, Jour. Rel. Vol. XI
 Findlay, G. Paul, H.D.B. Vol. III
 Granger, F. The Poimandres of Hermes Trimegistos, Jour. Theol. Stud. Vol. V, VIII
 Gardner, Percy Pagan Mysteries, Mod. Ch. Oct. 1926.
 " Mysteries, E.R.E. Vol. IX
 Hazzard The Mysticism of the Fourth Gospel, Thesis, 1927
 Hoyle, R.B. The Holy Spirit of God, E.R.E. Vol. XI
 Kennedy, H.A.A. St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, Exp. Vol. V
 " St. Paul's Conception of the Heavenly Man, Exp. VII
 " " of the Knowledge of God, Exp. XVI
 " The Significance & Range of the Covenant Conception in the New Testament, Exp. X
 " Paul and the Law, Exp. XIII
 " A New Interpretation of Paulinism, Exp. 1917
 Lake, K. Jesus, Hibb. Jour. Vol. XXIII
 Lietzmann, H. Baptism, Enc. Britt. 14th ed. Vol. III.
 Loisy, A. The Christian Mystery, Hibb. Jour. Vol. X
 Moffatt, J. The Lord's Supper in the Fourth Gospel, Exp. 8th Series, Vol. VI
 Mosley, J.K. Emil Brunner, Exp. Times, Apr. 1932.
 Milligan, G. Gamaliel, H.D.B. Vol. II
 Scott, E.F. The Hellenistic Mysticism of the Fourth Gospel, Am. Jr. Th. Vol. XX
 Stock, St. George Hermes Trismegistus, E.R.E. Vol. VI

2. OLD TESTAMENT

- Davidson, A.B. Prophecy and Prophets, H.D.B.

3. MYSTICISM.

- Abelson, J. Hebrew and Jewish Mysticism, E.R.E. Vol. IX
 Bevan, A.A. Manichaeism, E.R.E. Vol. VIII.
 Coe, G.A. The Sources of Mystical Revelation, Hibb. Jour. Vol. VI
 Geden, A.S. Upanishads, E.R.E. Vol. XII
 Holmes, E. The Mystic as Explorer, Hibb. Jour. Vol. XXVI
 Oman, J. Mysticism and its Expositors "
 McAlpine, W. The Validity of Mystical Knowledge, Thesis 1931